The Journal of Historical Review

THIS ISSUE

Papers Presented at the
1980 Revisionist Convention
at Pomona College
Claremont, California

The Holocaust Debate

Raphael Lemkin

Japanese Camps in California

Waffen - SS

also

The Big Lie Technique

Buchenwald and After

Holocaust Pharmacology

ALSO

Letters to the Editor

Revisionist Announcements

Volume Two, Number One Spring 1981

The Journal of Historical Review (ISSN: 0195-6752) is published quarterly by the Legion for the Survival of Freedom, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscriptions cost U.S. $20.00 per year, or the equivalent in foreign currency. Foreign subscribers should add $5 if paying with a remittance drawn on a foreign bank. For air-mail delivery overseas, please also add $5. Bulk subscription rates are available on request. Manuscripts are welcomed by the Editor, but must be accompanied by return postage.

Listed:

Library of Congress
British Library
Encyclopedia of Associations
Writers Market 1981
PTLA Catalog

ISSN: 0195-6752

Institute for Historical Review
P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, Ca. 90505, U.S.A.

Permission is hereby granted for reprints of any article contained herein, providing that no changes or alterations are made before off-printing, and also providing that the following attribution is included:

"Reprinted by permission of THE JOURNAL OF HISTORICAL REVIEW, P.O. Box 1306, Torrance, California 90505, United States of America. Subscription rate: $20.00 per year."

Two copies of each offprint should be submitted to the Editor.

J1. D1.J587

CONTENTS

A Note from the Editor.....4
Lewis Brandon

Letters to the Editor 7

The Holocaust Debate.....11
John Bennett

Raphael Lemkin and the Invention of "Genocide" 19
James J. Martin

The Big Lie Technique in the Sandbox 35
Lewis Brandon

The Japanese Camps in California 45
Mark Weber

The European Volunteer Movement in World War II.....59
Richard Landwehr

Buchenwald and After 85
Leonhard Friedrich

Holocaust Pharmacology vs. Scientific Pharmacology....91
Horst Kehl

About the Contributors.....96

A Note From The Editor

This issue, we are again privileged to welcome new names onto our distinguished Editorial Advisory Committee. Percy L. Greaves Jr. graduated in Business from Syracuse University in 1929, and studied Economics at Columbia University in New York City. He later worked as Financial Editor of the (now merged) *U.S. News*. In 1980, he ran as a Presidential candidate for the American Party. Dr. Charles E. Weber teaches in the Faculty of Letters at the University of Tulsa in Oklahoma. He authored a fine book review which appeared in our first issue. Dr. Weber has repeatedly come under fire from the illegal Anti-Defamation League but writes to us in his letter of acceptance: "My ordeal, instigated by the ADL, while not to be taken lightly, has had a tendency to stiffen my resistance."

Of course, we do not envy the ADL their current predicament. After 66 years of policing the thoughts of America, and peddling lie after lie ("the Nazi slaughter of 17 million human beings" according to their "10 Priorities" pamphlet) the Anti-Defamatory pigeons are now coming home to roost on number 823 United Nations Plaza with some unsanitary results!

Not only are the Zionist Thought Police having to deal with stubborn academics such as those temerarious members of our Editorial Advisory Committee, who value truth more than career advancement, but the ADL are now having to deal with a train of events among their own community which few could have anticipated.

On the one hand, there are those brave individuals among the Jewish community who can see the writing on the wall. Moshe Menuhin and Rabbi Elmer Berger (whose memoirs we sell at $13 and $5 respectively) laid the groundwork for the current campaigns by Jews to rescue their kinfolk from the clutches of unscrupulous, power-mad Zionists. Dr. Alfred Lilienthal believes that when the American people finally realize how they have been conned for so long, they may direct their anger not just at the Zionists responsible for the trickery, but against all Jews. Bezalel Chaim of the Revisionist Press in Brooklyn believes that Zionism is anti-Jewish, since the traditions of Jewry are for a libertarian lifestyle, not vicious, statist, repression and imperialism. Outspoken Orthodox leaders such as Rabbi Moshe Hirsch of the Neturei Karta sect maintain that Zionism is unreligious,

and in fact a blasphemy. Jewish thinkers such as Noam Chomsky of MIT and Dr. Howard Stein of the University of Oklahoma (whose feature on the Psychohistory of the Holocaust we published last time) believe that we have a *duty* to pursue the truth, no matter what the consequences. With such courageous fighters for truth inside the Jewish community itself we should all take hope that the Zionists have not had everything their own way. And with more and more Jews realizing and decrying the dangers of Zionist superimposition on Jewry, let us also hope that Dr. Lilienthal's fears of a host community backlash against all Jews (once the Zionists' game is widely discovered) will not be realized.

A much greater problem for the Zionist internal gestapo at the moment is the phenomenon of naive zealots letting the cat out of the bag. Our old friend Yaakov Riz, who has in his basement Holocaust museum a bar of Jewish soap which stubbornly refuses to be forensically examined (see our Summer 1980 issue, page 132) wrote in the *Jewish Press* of 5 September 1980 that Jews should use as much trickery as possible in peddling Holocaust lies. He gave an example from the Talmud where the angels Michael and Gabriel tricked God into drowning an entire army (or as some might say, a platoon?) of Egyptians. They did this by showing God a dead Jewish child and an Egyptian brick (or as some might say, a dead typhus victim and an empty can of Zyklon B?) Such open advocacy of mendacity cannot be other than an embarrassment to the ADL's slick Exterminationist propaganda machine.

Likewise, the zealots of the so-called Jewish Defense League must have caused a few gulps at UN Plaza. On the last day of November two dozen JDL "militants" paraded their scrawny physiques outside the Orange County home of Dr. Reinhard Buchner, here in Southern California. Among other slogans, they chanted: "Who do we want? Buchner! How do we want him? Dead!" Their niceties were reported in the next day's *Los Angeles Herald Examiner*, and followed up by some editorial condemnation from the normally Judaeophile paper.

One of the most insightful revelations was published in Chicago, in the aftermath of Moshe Dayan's remarks on Israeli TV that the quality of America's armed forces was low because the ranks were filled with "Blacks who have low intelligence and low education" and that Israel's survival could depend on U.S. military intervention. He went on to advocate a renewed draft to "ensure that fresh blood

and better brains" go into the U.S. forces. One of the most distinguished columnists on the *Chicago Sun-Times*, Mike Royko, responded (26 November 1980) that Dayan's remarks were racist, insulting, and downright arrogant. As if that was not bold enough in itself, Royko also spent eleven paragraphs describing what happens to any columnist who dares utter the mildest criticism of the Israeli *junta*. He wrote that "if there's anything as certain as sunrise, it's that a writer who dares criticize Israel's government policies will be accused of being anti-Semitic." He went on to describe how critics are subjected to letter-writing campaigns, and Israeli government demands for "meetings" with the writer and/or his bosses. He pointed out how American newspaper criticism of the Israeli government is much milder that that in Israeli newspapers, but that the "hypersensitivity" of Jewish-American organizations means that "Most commentators think very carefully before they set out to write something about Israel. Nobody wants to be bombarded with the ugly charge of anti-Semitism."

Here we have an example of Zionist arrogance not only letting the cat out of the bag—that Zionists *don't* think that Blacks are just like us except for the color of their skin; that Zionists *don't* believe in the freedom of individuals not to be drafted into military slavery; that Zionists *don't* think that the U.S. shouldn't interfere in countries overseas—but we also have here an example of the Gentile backlash against such brazen presumptuousness. Of course it may be that Mr. Royko spent his eleven paragraphs discussing Zionist hypersensitivity to criticism in order to *head off* just such responses, or at least to head off a carpeting from the local Israeli consul. (In fact, Mr. Royko's audacious column will be one of the principal items in the file which the ADL have already opened on him, and if the file starts to grow even a little bit too bulky, he will have to seek employment elsewhere.)

The real significance of the Royko column is that it shows just what kind of thing happens when foolhardy Zionist zealots let their mouths run away with them, especially if there are media present. If Mr. Royko can see through Zionist trickery and arrogance where intervention is concerned, there is no telling what will happen when some Zionist loudmouth lets slip the truth about the "Holocaust."

LEWIS BRANDON
Director: Institute for Historical Review
Editor: *The Journal of Historical Review*

Letters to the Editor

8 October 1980

Dear Mr. Branton: (*sic*)

Thank you for writing in response to *People Weekly's* 25 August issue article on Samuel Pisar. We are glad to have the opportunity to respond to your comments.

Mr. Pisar's assertion regarding the existence of a gas chamber compound at Auschwitz is supported by reputable sources too numerous to list. The *New York Times* on 24 February 1979 published a photograph of the extermination unit at Auschwitz taken from a WWII aerial reconnaissance film. In this photograph, a gas chamber was fully visible. In addition, testimony at the War Crimes Trials of 1964 from survivors of the Holocaust verified that there were indeed gas chambers at Auschwitz. While you disagree with this evidence—along with scores of books written on the subject—we trust that the foregoing has stated our point of view.

Sincerely yours,

Maureen Fulton
People Weekly
Rockefeller Center
New York, NY 10020

* * *

31 October 1980

Dear Mr. Lewis: (*sic!*)

Please remove my name from your mailing list as per requirements of the U.S. Postal Law.

I have close personal friends who were interred (*sic!*) in concentration camps in Europe during the second World War; and I have an uncle who "liberated" the first such camp in Europe who has photographs and documentation as to their existence.

Denying truth and reality will not make it go away. And to do so to profit from those who are mentally and socially malformed is reprehensible.

Any so-called "academic" which supports your mythology probably also believes in flying saucers, astrology, superman, aryan superiority and that man is civilized; and they have no right to call themselves educated men.

I feel quite certain that your backing comes from foreign governments and organizations and wonder whether you have registered as a lobby organization with the Justice Department. Your concepts are alien to all that the United States of America stands for in this troubled world of ours.

With no respect,

Dr. Marvin R. Bensman
Professor
Department of Theatre and
Communication Arts
Memphis State University
Memphis, TN 38152

* * *

6 November 1980

Why don't you offer special discounts on swastika armbands and the like?

Sincerely,

James K. Ash, Director
Japan Program & Cooperative
Education Department
Fort Lewis College
Durango, CO 81301

* * *

4 November 1980

Gentlemen:

After a careful review of your publications, I find that I am distressed at their perspective and content.

Please be good enough to remove my name from your mailing list.

Sincerely,

Dr. Peter O'Keefe
Associate Professor
Department of History
Marist College
Poughkeepsie, NY 12601

* * *

30 October 1980

Dear Sir/Madame:

This is to inform you that I find your literature *offensive*, and would be most appreciative if you would remove my name from your mailing list *immediately*. Thank You.

R.J. DiCenzo
Asst. Prof.: History
East Asian Studies
Department of History
Oberlin College
Oberlin, OH 44074

The Holocaust Debate

JOHN BENNETT

Since I was a speaker at the convention here in this city of Los Angeles last year, it seems to me very little has changed in America since that time. You seem to be still living in a "1984" situation where important public issues can't be debated in the media. Perhaps you need some guarantee of freedom of speech and freedom of press in your Constitution? Ah, you have it don't you? Well, it doesn't seem to be working very effectively!

You might think of Australia just as a place where kangaroos hop down the main streets, that it is a bit of a quarry for raw materials, and a place where you can plant your military bases so we can become a nuclear target. But, we also seem to be a country where there is a fair amount of freedom of speech on important issues and in particular a very important issue—the Holocaust.

One reason that I've become involved in the worldwide debate about the Holocaust, is that it is, as Zionist Jews say, "Israel's number one propaganda weapon," and the feelings of guilt inculcated in Western society about the Holocaust led to uncritical support of Israel which in turn could lead to world war, and has already contributed to a sevenfold increase in oil prices. So, obviously, the Holocaust is an important issue. It is not a relatively trivial question such as why the ship the *Lusitania* was sunk in 1916 or why particular incidents happened in the First or the Second World War.

The suppression of truth about the Holocaust could more or less directly contribute significantly to a real Holocaust, a world war in which many people, including Australians and Americans—in particular White people—would suffer grievously. As a matter of some interest: why in a country such as America where most people can say anything they like (the laws of obcenity here being what they are) and do

practically anything they like, the one thing Americans *can't do* is to publicly challenge the Holocaust, or the "Holy Cause," as it perhaps may be more accurately described. When I was over here last time in America, I sent a letter to eighty important newspapers here in the U.S. and to most of your television networks. There was only one paper that published that letter and it was *The Spotlight*. It was, I thought, a fairly good letter relating in essence to the survival of the human species in the terms I have already indicated; the possiblility of a world war due to mass mind-manipulation especially in relation to the Holocaust. Although we don't have a Constitutional guarantee of freedom of speech in Australia, we do in fact seem to have a greater degree of of freedom of speech than you do in America. However, the very wide-ranging debate about the Holocaust in Australia may be very largely due to the fact that I to a large extent initiated it and I have a reputation of being somebody who defends freedom of speech, and it became very difficult for people trying to shut me up to say that I was a neo-Nazi or an anti-Semite or a pathological case, etc.

In Australia the Holocaust has been debated on three of our four nationwide television stations. It has been widely debated in important papers such as the *Melbourne Age* and important (by Australian standards) weeklies and monthlies. To draw some American comparison; if you could get a debate going on the NBC, the ABC and the CBS, the *Los Angeles Times*, The *New York Times*, and Mr. William Buckley's magazine, the *National Review*, you would then have something like the debate that has happened in Australia. Of course, as I have indicated by my reference to the eighty letters that I sent when I was over here the last time and only one being published, it is very difficult to get this important issue discussed in the media and perhaps other issues as well; which of course leads directly to the issue, or the question, as to who controls the media in the United States. Just looking at the credits of the appalling TV programs and appalling films we usually get in Australia from America, it is to me quite obvious who controls very significant parts of the media here in Ameri-

ca. The people who control the media here are of course Zionist Jews, and anti-Zionist Jews such as Alfred Lilienthal and other very courageous people have all sorts of difficulties in getting their views ventilated.

I think that in fact there are many more anti-Zionist Jews then is apparent on the face of it, because Jews, like Gentiles, have been brainwashed into accepting a certain view of history, and they, like Gentiles, find it very difficult to buck peer group pressure, think for themselves, and ignore verbal threats to themselves, and don't worry about their job prospects. There are some Jews in Australia, and some in America, who are prepared to look into the question of the Holocaust, and it is really just a question of starting to ask the right questions. Because if you don't ask the right questions or if you don't ask any relevant questions, you can't get any answers or you certainly can't get the right answers. You've just got to ask questions such as "Why do we have so much propaganda about the Holocaust?" "Why do Americans know that six million Jews died in the Second World War, but don't know how many Americans died?" "Why do we get so much propaganda from Hollywood about Jewish suffering and so little information about the suffering of other peoples?" Of course, Jews did suffer during the Second World War, Germans suffered during the Second World War. Just about everybody suffers in war. If there is to be another world war arising from suppression of truth about the Holocaust and arising from Israel, of course that will be a real Holocaust, a massive holocaust in which all people—Australians, Germans, Americans—will suffer.

Of course, I am from Australia: which is virtually a colony of America, and America is virtually a colony of Israel, so we don't particularly wish to be on the receiving end of a war arising from censorship in America and arising from the gutlessness of (especially) American academics and indeed academics everywhere, to discuss this issue. Anybody who's had very much to do with trying to get a debate going in relation to the Holocaust—(and there is a Mr. Smith here who put out a little magazine called *Smith's Journal* who would perhaps know what I am talking about)—would know that there all sorts of strategems and mechanisms to try to

silence debate. One of the most effective strategems is just what could be called, I suppose, the silent treatment—not to have any debate at all. But there is a great responsibility lying upon historians in this issue.

The first thing I did as a fairly logical lawyer when I first read the Butz book (*The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, IHR, $10.00; paperback, $6.00) I thought to myself as I reeled about (because it rather upsets the mind to think that one could be conned for so long on such a basic historic issue)—the first thing I did was to post off copies of Butz to historians around Australia asking for their comments. Some of them wrote back saying I was a neo-Nazi and an anti-Semite, that sort of thing. Others might have made a few perfunctory points, which I answered. I then answered their answer and then there was silence and I would write more letters saying "Would you care to elaborate on this, etc." So I think the main reason that there isn't a debate on the Holocaust is that if there is a debate, if there were free trade in ideas on this issue, there would be no doubt as to what the truth is. The truth is set out more or less in the Butz thesis or the Faurisson thesis. But it is impossible to have freedom of speech and then free debate and arrive at the truth where you have people persecuted, where you have people becoming perhaps unnecessarily afraid, where you have a controlled media preventing a free discussion of these issues.

I said before that the problem is not so much that the wrong answers are being given, but that the right questions are not being asked. Because you only have to start asking questions such as "Why *Zyklon B* was used?" "Why were there concentration camps?" "Why was Auschwitz there?" "Why was it established?" "What industrial functions took place at Auschwitz?" "Were the Germans short of labor in 1944?" "Was it logistically feasible to move so many people say from Hungary to Auschwitz in 1944?" Just ask a series of questions and the answers are quite obvious, I think, from even a fairly perfunctory reading of the available data. If you keep on asking the right questions, you will eventually get the right answers.

I've ceased asking questions about the Holocaust because

I find it rather boring. I would find it equally boring had the Germans won the war and had the Germans a great deal of control over the media here; if I was facing Holocaust films twice a week about the bombing of German cities. That was to my mind about the closest thing to a genocide policy in the Second World War, but we hear very, very little about that in the media. I think it was the type of war where total victory led not to total falsehood (because there is a great deal of truth in the Jewish version of the Holocaust legend, as Butz points out) but, also to a significant degree of lies in relation to the Holocaust.

Normally, of course, people such as myself wouldn't bother looking into the Holocaust, wouldn't bother getting into some of the sort of trouble I got into in Australia, were it not for the fact that it is, as Zionist Jews say, "Israel's number one propaganda weapon" and Israel and its policies could quite easily lead to a world war.

I'm not religious myself and it is a bit hard for me to understand what motivates religious people. But in Australia, where we have a huge amount of desert, it would strike me as being extremely strange if a group of fanatics tried to get control of a few square miles of desert because of some book written a long time ago saying that they were entitled to it. But, unfortunately, this little bit of desert called the West Bank is important to them; Jerusalem is important to them. Unfortunately, it is also important to the Muslims and the Arabs, and perhaps unfortunately the Arabs control a great deal of the world's oil. And unfortunately for most of us who drive motor vehicles, as we have to pay the price. And indeed, Dr. Lilienthal wrote a book, *What Price Israel?* and indeed what a price we are paying. And I think it was Dr. Lilienthal, and other anti-Zionist Jews, who pointed out a very long time ago that trying to plant a Western type colony in a Muslim world would inevitably lead to the sort of trouble that it has led to.

When I was over here last time in America, it was my first trip overseas because I don't believe people learn very much from travel; I only came because I thought it was an important issue. I stressed the importance of trying to overcome the censorship problem of which you have so much

more here in America than we have in Australia, by action by individuals, and I am a great believer that individuals can do a great deal—quite apart from what groups might do. Individuals can send out fliers to the media, as I did when I was here last time. They can donate various books to libraries, they can write letters to newspapers. I know it is very disheartening if you write off ten letters to newspapers and none of them are published. People tend to give up. But I think it is very important just to be dogged and persistent on an issue which could lead—fairly directly or indirectly—to world war.

I have been Secretary of the Council for Civil Liberties in Victoria for fourteen years and I know that your view of civil liberties is perhaps colored by the ACLU, which consists mainly of trendy left liberal do-gooders, I suppose, who tend to believe in freedom of speech for the causes that they espouse but not otherwise; whereas I personally believe in freedom of speech for everybody unless there is a clear and direct threat to public order or national security. I've tried to encourage freedom of speech in Australia on the issue of the Holocaust, and I've perhaps attracted less flak in Australia and I've had greater access to the media because my bona fides are not in doubt and I have developed a reputation for defending people's freedom of speech. In fact, about ten years ago I defended the right of several self-styled Nazis in Australia for freedom of speech, believing then that they were associated with a movement that had led to the deliberate killing of six million Jews. I suppose like so many other people, I was so conditioned not to ask questions that if anybody queried any aspect of the Holocaust, I would tend to believe that the person must be a Nazi, that he must be the sort of person who would gas Jews—sort of a rather ridiculous Catch-22 situation.

If you say that there was no plan of genocide in the Second World War and there were no mass gassings, people tend to say "Oh you're a Nazi or a neo-Nazi, you're the sort of person who believes that there should be a plan of genocide and there should be mass gassing." There is so much illogicality in this area that I, as a lawyer, am amazed and as I've indicated, I try to indulge in some sort of debate with

Australian academics and I've never come across so many desperate attemps to obscure the issues, ignore the issues, and refuse to indulge in dialogue. I think the reason is fairly obvious, that it is, as a Zionist Jew in Australia said in relation to the Holocaust, "It is Israel's number one propaganda weapon" and they are not going to lose it very easily or gracefully.

Unfortunately from the point of view of Jews, the main or one significant group of victims of the Holocaust mythology are Jews themselves because it is used to buttress the state of Israel which doesn't give Jews security and never will. It just leads to insecurity for all people and all countries because of the prospect of a world war arising from Israel's seemingly, to me, a non-religious person, mad policies of trying to grab a bit of desert because a book some time ago said that they should be able to have control of it. They can have the entire Australian desert, if they like, and build their kibbutzes or whatever there.

So, I think one should bear in mind that Jews are as conditioned as non-Jews on this issue and perhaps there will only be a free discussion in America on the issue when people such as Alfred Lilienthal and perhaps Mr. Rothbard, and other Revisionist Jews, can have access to the media and make their views known.

Well, as I have indicated, I have had a fairly easy time of it in Australia, but as you know all Australians do is lie on beaches and laconically talk and talk with a drawl and keep their lips together so the blow flies won't get in—that's why we have our accent, you see. So I have had a fairly easy time of it in Australia by comparison. But in other countries —and this is one reason why it's so difficult to get to the truth on this subject—there's the prospect of say group libel for people such as professor Faurisson in France, there's the prospect of jail and social ostracism in West Germany, and there's the prospect in England of being socially ostracized and losing a job and being called a Nazi or an anti-Semite or whatever. It is fairly easy to shut people up. A lot of people who go around saying "Oh yes, I believe in freedom of speech and I agree with Voltaire, even if I disagree with what you say I will defend to the death your right to

say it." When the chips are down, there are not too many people who go along with Voltaire. It is a pity really that the ACLU in America hasn't, for instance, criticized the so-called Libertarian journals here for refusing to take advertisements for the Butz book. It is a pity that the ACLU hasn't drawn attention to the suppression of the Palestinian case in the American media.

I really don't wish to sound too anti-America, I understand one should try to be pleasant in countries which one visits. I poked fun at Los Angeles in most of the speech which I gave at the convention last year. I suppose I shouldn't do likewise here, even though it's such a delightfully easy city to poke fun at; so I won't do that.

But if people in America who put themselves forward as defenders of freedom of speech actually got out and did something about the suppression of ideas and the degree of political censorship in America, perhaps America could be more objective in relation to Israel and less likely to be seen as Israel's colony.

Raphael Lemkin and the Invention of 'Genocide'

Dr. JAMES J. MARTIN

Late in November 1944, midway during what the bible of the publishing industry, *Publishers Weekly*, prominently promoted as "Jewish Book Month" (10 November-10 December), Columbia University Press was credited with quietly releasing, without prestigious fanfare, a large (712pp) volume titled *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe: Laws of Occupation, Analysis of Government, Proposals for Redress.* Authored by a nearly total unknown in the U.S.A., one Raphael Lemkin, it has in reality become one of the most fateful works in the history of political thought in the 20th century.

Identified some months later as a refugee Polish Jew, a lawyer and a holder of a European Law doctorate, it took a while before the credentials of the author and the significance of his work began to sink in. In addition, the publication auspices of the work went unnoticed by nearly all, but they were ominous: *Axis Rule* was directly sponsored by the Division of International Law Publications of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, staffed with some of the most prestigious and implacable exponents of global war with Germany, long before it came about. Late in 1944 it was taking a leading position in the manufacture of post-war plans and schemes for rigging a world in harmony with and contributory to the interests of its prestigious sponsoring forces.

Though a succession of reviewers of his book turned cartwheels in parading a non-stop collection of superlatives over its alleged virtues, a vociferous accolade which continued for the better part of two years, Lemkin remained a

mystery man for the most part, and it was some time later before self-revealed details enabled anyone to know even the most elementary facts about who he was and where he came from. But in a succession of magazine articles he published after his book came out, the various editors disclosed that for a recent immigrant into the country, Lemkin had risen fast and traveled far. First identified as a former member of the International Office for the Unification of Criminal Law, a front for the old League of Nations, it was not long before more revealing material surfaced about his more recent employment.

Though he had arrived in the U.S. just a few months before American formal belligerency in the war in December 1941, he had vaulted upward with celerity for a refugee immigrant who presumably was not fluent in English, to judge from his publication record. By the time the book was published, over a year after it was completed, he had already served as the "head consultant"to the Foreign Economic Administration of the Roosevelt War machine, an agency mainly concerned with assignment and future ownership of the confiscated assets of the enemy. He also held jobs as an advisor to the Bureau of Economic Warfare and the War Department. Sandwiched in among these was a stint as a "foreign affairs" advisor to the State Department. Then came an appointment as lecturer before the School of Military Government at Charlottesville, Virginia, helping to train the men who were to become the administrators of conquered Germany in the time to come. Other prestigious appointments lay ahead, but these were his primary involvements during the time he was at work on his book.

There is no way of knowing whether the views credited to him were exclusively his own, or whether he was the mouthpiece through which the dominant forces behind the wartime establishment and the coming direction and control of much of Western Europe were announcing their positions. If this were true, his pedigree made some sense, as well as his lightning-like appearance and the swift dissemination of what he had to say in print. The combination was a sophisticated product which was aimed to hit the national community in one well-synchronized joint disquisition.

From information which was disseminated after his major successes in the United Nations, we know something about Raphael Lemkin's origins and background. He was born on 24 June 1901 near the town of Bezwodene in eastern Poland, which was part of Imperial Russia in that time. Neither Lemkin nor his tireless public relations people ever said much about his youth or what he did in the tumultous years of Russia's participation in World War One, the era of violence and chaos marking the collapse of the Romanov dynasty and the creation of Bolshevism. It appears that he was studying abroad during some of the time, in three countries, and was credited with having earned law doctorates at the Universities of Heidelberg, and of Lemberg, in his native Poland. Though Lemkin declared that his father was just a farmer, there seemed to be steady funds for expensive education abroad.

His first employment was as Secretary to the Court of Appeals in Warsaw, rising rapidly to become Public Prosecutor in that city in 1925. Lemkin in the 1950s claimed to have represented Poland at international conferences in several Western countries, becoming involved in Polish League of Nations activities, and in 1929 served as Secretary to the Commission of the Laws of the Polish Republic. In this capacity he represented Poland in the Fifth International Conference for the Unification of Criminal Law, held in Madrid in 1933. It was here that he is supposed to have made his first proposal, entreating the League to draw up a treaty to ban "mass slaughter." When one examines the documents involving his original presentations to the Legal Council of the League, however, they do not contain that language. Instead we find a document proposing the outlawing of "acts of barbarism and vandalism," and a study of "terrorism," which are quite removed from something as incendiary as "mass slaughter."

Lemkin separated from Polish State service, and, presumably, from all other related labors connected with the League of Nations, in 1935, returning to private law practice in Warsaw. In 1938 he was the editor of a 725-page book published in Krakow, titled *Prawo karne skarbowe*. This tome dealt almost exclusively with Polish internal reve-

nue laws and tax evasion in that country (probably an aggravated matter as a consequence of the behavior of all its many unhappy minorities, fully a third of the population in the Polish state which emerged after 1919, thanks in large part to President Woodrow Wilson of the U.S.A. and his ineffable advisor on Polish affairs, Harvard's Robert H. Lord). In 1939, Lemkin was especially busy. He got out, in an unlikely collaboration with Malcolm McDermott, a member of the North Carolina Bar, and also a faculty member of the Duke University Law School, a 95-page translation into English, titled *Polish Penal Code of 1932, and the Law of Minor Offenses*, issued simultaneously in the U.S.A. and England. The importance of this relationship will be described shortly.

Still another, and somewhat more substantial, work by Lemkin was published in 1939, this one in France, titled *La Règlementation des Paiements internationaux*, a 422-page work devoted to a problem of increasing importance in the disorderly financial world of the 1930s, and presumably of particular concern to the growing flow of emigres and refugees interested in getting their money out of one national state and into another, while presumably crossing the frontiers of one or more national states in doing so. It was Lemkin's major interest now, one to which he returned repeatedly thereafter.

Lemkin never discussed publicly or officially what he was doing during the Polish-German diplomatic crisis of the late summer of 1939, and the subsequent state of war. But a decade later he told a New York *Times* interviewer that he joined the civilian guerilla underground, after the Polish armed forces had ceased to fight, and the country occupied *in toto* by German and Russian armies, and fought, presumably only against the Germans, for six more months. Thus the proper international lawyer became a violator of the very first article of the Hague Agreements of 1899 and 1907 with respect to lawful civilian participation in war, and if captured might have been subject to summary execution as a *franc-tireur*. Smuggled out of Poland via Lithuania to the Baltic and thenceforth to Sweden in 1940, Lemkin, instead of being interned as a belligerent in a neutral land, promp-

ly resumed his academic career in law in Stockholm. In 1941 his lectures, presumably based on his book published in Paris in 1939, were issued in book form in Swedish, titled *Valutareglering och Clearing.*

At about this time Lemkin's famous migration to the U.S.A. took place, details of which were never publicized. The presumption is that he was spirited out of Sweden across the length of the Soviet Union to the American West Coast, and thence across the U.S.A. to the confines of Duke University, where he had already made contacts through his previous collaboration with Prof. McDermott. And shortly after arrival, Lemkin was installed as a Professor in the Duke Law School. A few days later, Lemkin was recruited to make a major address before the American Bar Association at their annual meeting, this one in Indianapolis, 29 September-3 October 1941, where his topic was "The Legal Framework of Totalitarian Control Over Foreign Economies." Disregarding that he confused "totalitarian" with "authoritarian," it revealed the persistence of his specialty in his public work. His branching out into the creation of new law was just around the corner, however.

By this time, Lemkin was already at work on his *magnum opus*, which was to be published as *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*. At least he must have begun the collection of the laws, decrees, emergency proclamations, order and other kinds of regulations issued in the occupied areas of Europe by Germany and its allies. Not many of these were hard to find. Published sources on the Continent contained most of them, and routinely went to law libraries all over the world, so there was nothing especially arcane about the subject material. What was original about the project was Lemkin's effort to divine how Axis-occupied Europe was organized and administered while using only legal and quasi-legal source material on which to base his entire work. Nothing in his book was a result of his personal witnessing of their operation or enforcement, nor did he cite anyone else who had. Furthermore, though much of what he presented as "evidence" for operational reality was emergency policy innovation, he assumed in every case that such policy was carried out to the letter of its legal description and re-

mained in force. Nowhere did he entertain the possibility that much of this may not have endured except for a few weeks or months, and might have been replaced, repealed, abandoned, modified drastically one way or another, unenforced, defied successfully, allowed to sit as mere formality, or any of several other possibilities.

This compendium of the above material accounts for two-thirds of the bulk of Lemkin's book, roughly the last 400 pages, arranged by country alphabetically and chronologically. How much of it he did cannot be established. Since he acknowledged the help of some 35 persons, and two of them were specifically designated as being responsible for the English style of the book, all of this is grounds for suspecting that his name was a cover for the work of a high-powered committee. Further emphasizing the likelihood of collaboration was the foreword to the book, written by George A. Finch, the director of the International Law Section of the parent Carnegie Foundation, a functionary of the organization for nearly 25 years. The lameness of his endorsement is not easy to describe; one can only wish that it were readily available for general consultation.

It is not possible to examine *Axis Rule* within the limits of this presentation insofar as its purported thesis is concerned, namely, as a study of the organization and administration of those areas of Europe occupied by the armed forces of Germany and its allies, 1939-44. Though Lemkin's introduction is dated 15 November 1943, the content of the book stops somewhat earlier than that. Nearly 70 percent of the documents concern only the years 1940-41, and only parts of those. There is little dealing with 1942, and the brief entries for 1943, which are virtually useless, are confined entirely to footnotes, mainly attached to the front part of the book, the 264 pages ostensibly written by Lemkin himself. Thus, the book tells us virtually nothing about German-occupied Europe after early 1942.

The principal task here is not an analysis of the main thesis of the book but a concentration upon a single aspect of it, in reality just a small fraction of the whole, but in terms of effect and consequence many times more fateful than the remaining pages of the volume combined. Because it is in

this book that the invented word "genocide" is first used, and the outlines of the invented crime of the same name are first plotted out. The ominous portent of both has inspired a vast literature and an alarming volume of talk and political maneuvering in the last thirty years, with plenty more projected to come, since "genocide" has long been construed an international crime.

A preliminary examination of the 400 pages of legal documentation gathered at the end of Lemkin's *Axis Rule* reveals that nearly three-quarters of it is culled from sources published in the years 1940-1941 alone. A close reading of the material confirms that the subject matter of the total collection is 80 percent concerned with money, property, exchange rates, conditions of employment, labor rules and compensation, transfers of ownership, international exchange rates and their control, and many related matter-of-fact regulations of the dullest and most prosaic sort, accompanied by similar stipulations regarding citizenship and mobility, in Axis-occupied countries.

However, scattered through this maze of of legal verbiage are a few sections, comprising *only three percent of the total*, which bear the sub-section heading, "genocide legislation." Reading these carefully is a revelation; an insight into what a sophisticated, complex and subtle offense Raphael Lemkin was originally engaged in fabricating. Nothing involved came within a light year of the vulgar rhetorical metaphor that "genocide" has degenerated to over the last 30 years. Perhaps it would be instructive to summarize this slim catalog, which will at the same time demonstrate what a feeble foundation lay under Lemkin's ambitious but sprawling new "crime." It will also reveal what a comically small bag of substance he was able to muster after this immense diligence in turning over the mountain of Axis legal baggage he and his tireless helpers were able to assemble. (A doctor who invents a new disease is called a "quack." There is no equivalent term for a lawyer who invents a new crime.) Lemkin's essay in legal alchemy was quite remarkable: a casual effort to persuade people to believe that someone else's *local legislation* was an *international felony* simultaneously.

Before going into Raphael Lemkin's confused attempts to define what he called "genocide," it is appropriate to summarize the Axis laws he selected out and identified as "genocide legislation." The first of these (*Axis Rule*, pp399-402), consists of the first, second and sixth orders designated as "measures against Jews" issued by the German Chief of Military Administration in Occupied France on 27 September and 18 October 1940 and 7 February 1942. The first called for the registration of all Jews living in Occupied France and forbade those who had fled elsewhere from coming back. It also required that all profit-making businesses owned by Jews in Occupied France to be designated as such. The second was an expansion of the first insofar as it dealt with the subject of required registration of Jewish-owned businesses. The sixth established an 8pm to 6am curfew for Jews, as well as a prohibition against Jews moving from their residences as of 7 February 1942 to some other location. Violations of these orders involved fines and imprisonment if violators were detected and convicted.

The second "genocide" law (*Axis Rule*, pp440-443), was an order of 6 August 1940 by the German Chief of Civil Administration in Luxembourg, which stipulated that the *official* language of the country insofar as it was used in the judicial and educational systems, as well as *official* publications of all kinds, was to be German; this was spelled out in another order of 14 September 1940. In this same "genocide" section was an order of 31 January 1941 requiring Luxembourg nationals and aliens alike to adopt a Germanic *first* name, while "recommending" that they Germanicize their family name as well if it was not already a Germanic one. The final item in this section was a decree of January 1941 requiring the registration in Luxembourg of all persons engaged in the enterprises of painting, architecture, design and drawing, music, literature and the theater, on pain of being forbidden to work in these fields should they be detected failing to register.

The third listing of a "genocide law" (*Axis Rule*, p504), a peculiar one, was an order signed by Adolf Hitler himself, and bearing also the signatures of General Keitel and Hitler's deputy, Lammers, on 28 July 1942, which provided

for a wide scale of economic benefits which would accrue to Norwegian and Dutch women nationals who became the mothers of children fathered by German occupation soldiers. Such subsidies, according to the language of the order, were intended to "remove any disadvantage from the mothers," while "promoting the development of the children."

Lemkin's fourth category of "genocide legislation" (*Axis Rule*, pp552-555), was along the lines of the one described immediately above, signed by the Governor General of occupied Poland, Hans Frank, making it possible for a person of German origin but not possessing German nationality, residing in Poland, to obtain a certificate which would document his German origin. This was accompanied by another order signed by Frank on 10 March 1942 establishing a grant of child subsidy to families of Germans resident in the Polish Government General, a large area of southern Poland occupied by German armies. To qualify for the small subsidy the family had to have at least three minor children already.

The fifth section of "genocide legislation" (*Axis Rule*, pp 625-627), were three laws put into effect in the new state of Croatia, separated from Yugoslavia, signed by its chief of state, Dr. Ante Pavelic. One nullified any legal business transaction between Jews, or between Jews and non-Jews, made within two months of the proclamation of the independence of the State of Croatia, if its total value exceeded 100 000 dinars, unless it had previously been approved by the Croatian Minister of Justice. The second prohibited the use of the Cyrillic alphabet in Croatia, and the third prohibited Croatian nationality except for persons of "Aryan origin" and who furthermore had not participated in activities hostile to the establishment of the "independent state of Croatia."

As afterthoughts, Lemkin threw in other "genocide legislation" sections related to his text, which preceded the ponderous collection of laws, and which had been gathered before the text was written. One (*Axis Rule*, p601), was an order signed by the German commander in occupied Serbia of 22 December 1941, which established the death penalty

for anyone apprehended *sheltering* Jews or hiding them, but mentioning no penalties whatever applying to the Jews themselves. Almost all of this order applied to Jewish property, not to their persons, calling for the registration of all such property, as well as contracts involving the purchase of, or barter for, Jewish assets on the part of non-Jews. The earlier part of the order seemed to be directed against the concealment of Jews returned as guerilla fighters, which hardly was uncommon.

And bringing up the tail end of this curious assemblage of "genocidic" legislation, as designated by Lemkin, was another which was not so identified in the appendix of laws, but referred to briefly in his text (*Axis Rule*, p249). This was a declaration by Lemkin that Jews in Serbia had been further disadvantaged by genocidic measures which deprived Jews of making a livelihood by specifically forbidding them to practice "professions." Lemkin's accompanying reference was to page 596 of the documents, which turned out to be an order signed by "The Military Commander in Serbia," dated 21 May 1941, which stated: "Jews amd gypsies or persons married to Jews or gypsies shall not be admitted to the operation" of "cabarets, vaudeville houses and similar places of entertainment."

Upon contemplating this miniscule assemblage of *ad hoc* actions, common to military occupiers under differing circumstances for dozens of centuries in the past, one wonders how Lemkin was able to conjure up the dramatic definitions he was to loose upon the world of his new crime. What he found to support it of a legal nature rightly inspires hilarity, though it might be considered characteristic of what a pettifogger might dredge up in turning over the lesser debris of history. Now we may proceed to his general definitions of "genocide," keeping all the foregoing in mind.

The first one is the elucidation in his preface to his book:

> The practice of extermination of nations and ethnic groups as carried out by the invaders is called by the author (Lemkin) "genocide," a term derived from the Greek word *genos* (tribe, race) and the Latin *cide* (by way of analogy see homocide (*sic*), fratricide. . .

Ignoring that there was no analogy whatever between a *specific* crime such as homicide (Lemkin misspelled the word) or fratricide and a spongy, vague and opaque alleged offense such as he was inventing and attempting to promote, we may be led to wonder how he was able to conclude, from the pedestrian collection of regulations he cited in his evidence, such a dramatic conclusion as that of *extermination* of entire ethnic groups and "nations." (From later contexts Lemkin apparently meant by "nation" about the same thing: an entity within a national state or community of some recognizable ethnic composition.) The assumption here is that by *extermination* he really meant what he was saying, instead of indulging in some talmudic flight of rhetorical exaggerated literary effect. If he were talking about facts instead of trying out an imaginative metaphor, he had presented absolutely nothing in evidence to document such a policy as extermination of anyone, anywhere.

To compound the confusion, however, Lemkin on page 78 of *Axis Rule* in his short chapter titled "Genocide," introduced another definition. "By 'genocide' we mean the destruction of a nation or ethnic group," which he clarified in this manner: "Genocide has two phases: one, the destruction of the national pattern of the oppressed group; the other, the imposition of the national pattern of the oppressor." His final elaboration on this was as follows: "Denationalization was the word used in the past to describe the destruction of a national pattern."

It is obvious that these definitions are contradictory. Since the first, "extermination," taken in its dictionary definition to mean "to destroy utterly" (*Webster's Collegiate Dictionary*, 5th ed., 1948, p354), has a finality about it which should recommend itself to the most sophisticated practitioner of barratry, there does not seem to be anything left to be concerned with. But Lemkin's second definition some 80 pages later clearly indicated "genocide" to be a *process* by which something was being transformed into something else, a group losing its "national pattern" and taking on that of its "oppressor." So what Lemkin was talking about in definition No. 2 was not "destruction" in a physical sense

of the killing of everyone, or even *anyone*, only the imposition upon a "group" of a totally different cultural identity; in other words, *assimilation*. This was obviously a vast distance from *extermination* (actually, Lemkin had at his disposal an even stronger word, *extirpation*, which not only meant total and utter destruction, but the *intentional and planned* rooting out in a violent manner of something. Since Lemkin was to make it the first condition for something to be "genocide" that it had to be the *planned, deliberate, intentional* action destructive to a "national, racial, ethnical or religious" group, "extirpation" should have been his word.) And Lemkin added still another contradiction to his collection: after his efforts to create the impression elsewhere that "genocide" was a new "crime," he had to go and spoil it by a flat admission that it was the ancient practice of "denationalization" dressed out in a fright wig.

Though Lemkin went on to expand upon his second definition of "genocide," with a brief discourse concerning the various areas of a social system where impositions were being placed on "groups" which furthered their "genocide," it was plain from at least three areas in his book that the whole concept of "genocide" insofar as he had brought it together in 1943 was exceedingly thin, and was not a part of his original plan when he began *Axis Rule in Occupied Europe*.

Only once in his book did he admit that by "group" as he used it he meant only *minority* groups. His recipe included no brief for the protection of a putative majority anywhere; as a consequence of the way he approached the subject philosophically and psychologically, he was unable to conceive of a situation where a majority group might be the one in grave danger of disappearance.

Since only three percent of his entire work was devoted to the subject of "genocide," it was obvious that it was a very subdued matter for his concern originally, if not nearly incidental to his purpose in writing the book. Secondly, his chapter dealing with the legal position of Europe's Jews was only three pages long, and 80 percent of those three pages were devoted to various property considerations. And in the third place, when we come to the portion of his book en-

titled "Proposals for Redress," nearly all of that concerned his suggestions for the creation after the war of several complicated levels of "restitution courts," which would be devoted almost entirely to the job of restoring the material *status quo ante bellum*, if not going back all the way to 1933. His recommendations at this stage involved no "war criminal" charges, no suggestions for legal processes leading to execution or long penitentiary sentences for anyone, despite naming an occasional person in an invidious manner.

In view of his decision to include, in what is almost totally a dull treatise confined to a multitude of economic changes brought about in Axis-occupied Europe, his sensational "genocide" issue, one may wonder why there is so little time spent on it in such a large book; about in the three-pound class. Since the idea is so meagerly spelled out to begin with, and since there is so little about it, one must conclude that it was an after-thought when placed against the main topic of Axis organization and administration of Occupied Europe. Since *this* subject is so sketchily developed as well, and includes nothing on it for about the last half of the war, one may also wonder whether the book has much value in any context.

It becomes apparent then that the idea needed a great deal more work. Therefore the expansion of the entire imaginative enterprise is found far more significant in a series of articles Lemkin wrote between 1945 and 1948 for periodicals ranging from the *American Journal of International Law*, *American Scholar* and the *United Nations Bulletin*, to the *Nation*, and the *Christian Science Monitor*, along with frequent column-and-a-half-long letters to the editor of the New York *Times*. During those three years, the big liberal-minority newspapers of the world made his new word famous.

The most curious aspect of his original efforts in fabricating "genocide" in *Axis Rule* concerns the few lines he entered therein on the subject of alleged mass slaughter of European Jews. His long legal section included not the faintest reference to any kind of law, decree, order, promulgation or whatever providing for putting to death anyone for any reason, unless it was as a result of prosecution and

conviction for a violation of a plainly stipulated offense somewhere. Therefore—what was his justification of evidence for introducing the allegation at all? Here we run into a barrier. Although his book does not contain a word referring to anything he ever witnessed personally, the mass murder charge is even more remotely located from evidence. And if the "genocide" idea was an afterthought within the context of the entire book, then the mass murder allegation was itself an afterthought within the imaginative "genocide" confection. The subject is discussed very briefly in his text, the reference being the self-serving propaganda *White* and *Black Books* published under the auspices of the Polish government-in-exile in 1942, lodged in London. And it is brought up for consideration again in footnote references, where the sources referred to are the famous declaration of the wartime (allied) United Nations at Christmas time, 1942, published shortly after New Year's Day of 1943, and two small books issued by the even more self-serving Institute for Jewish Affairs of the American Jewish Congress, also in 1943. It is significant that these two books were published under the aegis of one Zorach Warhaftig, another Jewish lawyer from Warsaw, but also a fierce Zionist, who disappeared from Poland in 1939, surfacing in New York in 1943 as deputy director of this Institute for Jewish Affairs, a post he held until 1947. Feverishly active in the post-May 1945 effort to get as many as possible of Europe's displaced-person Jews to Palestine, Warhaftig subsequently followed them there. Becoming a signer of the Declaration of Independence of the State of Israel in 1948, as well as a member of the executive council of the World Jewish Congress, Warhaftig from 1951-1965 was Deputy Minister of Religion in various Israeli governments. The two books issue under Warhaftig's direction, *Hitler's Ten Year War on the Jews*, and *Starvation Over Europe; Made in Germany*, were actually written by Boris Shub, whose father David authored a famous biography of Lemkin, wrote for the Social Democrat *New Leader* and was the chief editorial writer of New York City's *Jewish Daily Forward*, but are mentioned in Lemkin's book almost as additions to the corrected page proofs, so little do they have to do with his

ongoing narrative.

With this in mind, one may ponder how Raphael Lemkin got the reputation for being the first to allege that National Socialist Germany and its allies had massacred this or that many million Jews. This has been declared as fact in a variety of volumes, and there are mistakes related to Lemkin's book repeated in several places. It is plain that he was far from the first to make this charge, and derived all he pretended to know about it from previously published sources. In this department he even trailed badly the charge made in the London *Jewish Chronicle* as far back as 11 December 1942 that 2 000 000 Jews had already been put to death on the Continent of Europe. And this source in turn was well behind others made prior to that date. Even the figures Lemkin repeated from the books published by the Institute for Jewish Affairs, some time later, were smaller than these, as well as several others.

It is possible that Lemkin, after realizing what a pallid and colorless account was emerging from his diligently assembled but essentially unsubstantial legal construct, decided that it needed fanciful decoration to instill some drama into it. Hence the addition of the sensational mass murder allegations, despite their brevity and obscure placement. There appear to have been limitations on his imagination and his poetic resources, however. He did not employ any word resembling "holocaust" in his elaborations either in *Axis Rule* or his prolific serial publications efforts later on, despite his attraction to Greek-root word origins. Since the dictionaries specifically defined "holocaust" as wholesale destruction of life by fire, something the Germans and Japanese were actually undergoing as a result of Allied strategic bombing, it might have been construed as improper to appropriate that word in his decision to go along with Zionist propaganda of the hour in alleging Jewish annihilation.

Perhaps this pretentious but essentially weak and insubstantial sortie into the thicket of sensational propaganda claims of vast loss of life sustained by European Jewry is an index to his entire labor from then on until the enshrinement of "genocide" as an international crime, and the creation of

a global agreement to make its suppression or punishment an extension of international law.

Raphael Lemkin's vigorous and ceaseless propagandizing of the representation in the new United Nations after 1945, until it agreed to consider "genocide" as a possible candidate for fleshing out, the incredible amount of time and energy spent in a committee of the United Nations expanding the definition of "genocide" for two years, and eventual adoption by the General Assembly on 9 December 1948, is a long and involved narrative. Just as long and exhausting is the story of the continuing drive to bring about its ratification by sufficient member States of the UN to make the Genocide Convention actual international law. This was achieved in January 1951 when some 20 States, representing about 3 percent of the world's population, made it all possible. This number had been attained by October 1950, and the Convention became automatically in force 90 days later.

The next scene of the drama was the incredible effort made to secure ratification of the Genocide Convention by the United States Senate, a drive in which Lemkin suffered his first but disastrous defeat. His campaign never recovered from this rejection. Though the number of ratifying states worldwide now approximates 80, the U.S.A. still is numbered among the non-ratifiers, and the chances of this course being abandoned diminish with each passing year.

So the world is left clutching a husk, an unenforced and unenforceable piece of synthetic minority international law, in reality a tasteless reminder and remnant of World War Two in the form of an ugly neologism, but evidence that, with vast labor and proper publicity, something can still be made out of almost nothing.

The Big Lie Technique in the Sandbox

LEWIS BRANDON

One of today's pet Indisputable Historical Truths is that the German Chancellor Adolf Hitler advocated the "Big Lie Technique" to discredit and confuse one's political opponents. However, a close look at the German leader's writings displays a somewhat different approach. On pages 134 and 173 of *Mein Kampf* (*My Stuggle*) (Hurst & Blackett edition, 1942; reprint available from Angriff Press, PO Box 2726, Hollywood, CA 90028, $10) Hitler echoes the German philosopher Schopenhauer and alleges that it is the Jews who are "The Great Master of Lies." At no point does he advocate the "Big Lie Technique" himself. On the contrary, he criticizes the Jews for allegedly adopting the technique themselves. It is ironic that Hitler himself fell posthumous victim to this tactic.

Hitler is not the only one to have suffered in this way. Even living historians are misrepresented. So too are history books and leading reference works. Let us now examine some recent examples.

Reference Books

The 1975 edition of the *Guiness Book of World Records* by the McWhirter twins (Bantam, New York, 1975) made the following reference under "Crime & Punishment" (p391):

> *NAZI GERMANY.* At the SS extermination camp known as Auschwitz-Birkenau (Oswiecim-Brezinka), near Oswiecim, in southern Poland, where a minimum of 900 000 people (Soviet estimate is 4 000 000) were exterminated from 14

> June 1940 to 29 January 1945, the greatest number killed in a day was 6000. . . .The former French Deputy, Professor Paul Rassinier, a Buchenwald survivor and holder of the *Medaille de la Résistance*, published evidence in 1964 to the effect that the total Jewish death count could have not exceeded 1 200 000, as opposed to the widely accepted figure of 6 000 000.

In succeeding editions the reference to Rassinier was omitted. I wrote to Norris McWhirter (his brother was assassinated by the Irish Republican Army terrorist gang) at Guiness Superlatives Ltd., 2 Cecil Court, Enfield, Middlesex EN2 6DJ, England, and inquired why this had been done. On 28 April 1980 he replied that it was because "the estimates that we attributed to Rassinier are simply not accepted by those who also discount the Soviet estimates. If you care to advise me of the names of authoritative agencies which do still accept the Rassinier estimate I shall be pleased to renew contact with them." I forwarded to McWhirter the names and universities of several leading Revisionist academics, but so far not one of them has heard from him.

Historians

British historian David Irving has also fallen victim to this tactic of re-writing history. In the introduction to *Hitler's War* (Viking, 1977; available from IHR at $19.00) Irving relates how the German edition of the book was censored by the German publishing house, Ullstein. He describes:

> The same Berlin company also published my book shortly after, under the title *Hitler & Seine Feldherren*; their chief editor found many of my arguments distasteful, even dangerous, and without informing me, suppressed or even reversed them: in *their* printed text Hitler had not told Himmler there was to be "no liquidation" of the Jews (on 30 November 1941); he had told him not to use the word "liquidate" publicly in connection with their extermination program. Thus history is falsified! (My suggestion that they publish Himmler's note as a facsimile had been ignored.) I prohibited further printing of the book, two days after its

> appearance in Germany. To explain their actions, the Berlin publishers argued that my manuscript expressed some views that were "an affront to established historical opinion" in their country.
>
> (*pxvii*)

Irving's reference to an "extermination program" is part of his pragmatic effort to continue to have his books published by Madison Avenue by sailing a very tight tack between truth and commercial acceptability. It is thought unlikely by many observers that Irving should be taken in by such a canard as the "six million."

Just in passing, it is interesting to read Irving's assessment of the "memoirs" or "diaries" of many of the Third Reich *dramatis personae*. Many of them are fiction, he shows.

In October 1978, the German publisher Propylaeen Verlag issued Professor Hellmut Diwald's massive *Geschichte der Deutschen* (*History of the Germans*). Diwald is a history professor at the Friedrich-Alexander University in Erlangen and has been well known in the German historical profession since taking his doctorate under the German-Jewish historian Hans-Joachim Schoeps more than 20 years ago. However, Diwald's credentials were not enough to authenticate some mild skepticism he expressed about the "Holocaust" on two pages of the 766 page book (164 and 165). A cacaphony of protest was yodelled from the political and publishing minarets throughout the Fatherland, and the publisher (part of the Axel Springer combine) quickly agreed to make amends. The sale of the first edition was stopped, and remaining copies withdrawn. A new edition was substituted, with the two offending pages hastily rewritten in order to conform to the "correct" line. This was only the beginning of the re-writing of the book: Springer announced that by Fall 1979 the book would be "not recognizable" (*Der Spiegel*, 4 December 1978).

Popular Books

Non-academic books are also subject to re-writes. In 1971 the Berkley Publishing Corporation of New York (a subsidiary of Putnam's) was to publish a book entitled *Lansky* by Hank Messick. Naively assuming that what was good for Jews is good for Gentiles, the publishers designed the cover and promotional advertisements with a slogan translated from an earlier book review in Hebrew in *Ha'aretz*, an Israeli newspaper.

Unfortunately, the translation read: "Jews control Crime in the United States." The ad appeared only once in the *New York Times* before the balloon went up. The Zionist Anti-Defamation League immediately contacted the publishers to "first appeal to reason" according to the *ADL Bulletin* for October 1971. When this "appeal to reason" did not bring about a positive response, the ADL adopted different tactics, and presto, the slogan on both the offending advertisement and on the book's cover, became: ". . .The Mob Runs America and Lansky Runs the Mob."

Newspapers

Newspapers are also subject to Zionist "revisionism." In the *New York Times* of 22 February 1948 a feature on the Jewish *putsch* in Palestine gave a population figure of 15 to 18 million Jews in the world. This figure would, of course, make the "Six Million" a demographic nonsense, as there were 15 million Jews in the world in 1940. Immediately, the Zionist lobby "appealed to the reason" of the publishers, and four days later, the following codicil was published:

> Last Sunday's article incorrectly estimated the Jewish population of the world at 15 million to 18 million. No census has been conducted since the war, and estimates are only approximate, but most authorities agree that Hitler's wholesale massacres of Jews during the war reduced the Jewish population to perhaps 12 million today.

Sensing that something was rotten in the state of publi-

shing, the ardent anti-Zionist Jew Benjamin Freedman investigated the case in 1959. In his newsletter *Common Sense* of 1 May 1959 he described how he had been allowed to visit the *Times* offices "through the courtesy of Mr. Arthur Hays Sulzberger" (at that time somewhat of an anti-Zionist Jew) in order to examine the reference file on the original article. He claimed to have met with the Military Editor, Hanson Baldwin, who showed him "the results of the(ir) searching investigations."

Eight years later, a Zionist writer, Morris Kominsky, investigated Freedman's investigation. Baldwin this time claimed that he had never met Freedman, as far as he could remember, and that the original figures were simply lifted from the 1948 edition of the *World Almanac*. The affair is discussed at length in Kominsky's book *The Hoaxers*, Brandon Press (no relation!), Boston, 1970.

Voices

Even voices can be faked. Many people have felt their pulses quicken as they listened to the famous speech of Sir Winston Churchill imploring the British population to "fight on the beaches, etc." Churchill made the speech in the House of Commons, but as broadcasting from the Houses of Parliament was not permitted, the speech would have to be presented over again for the BBC radio listeners. Since matters of state were more pressing, an actor was engaged to read the speech instead. His name was Norman Shelley, and he had already established a minor reputation as a Churchill imitator. The Prime Minister approved of the fakery, and even complimented Shelley on his accuracy. "Very nice," Churchill reportedly said, "he's even got my teeth right," referring to the rattling of his dentures.

The fakery remained a secret for 39 years until Shelley told of his role during an interview with the London *Daily Mail*. Shelley died on 22 August 1980, and his obituary in the *Los Angeles Times* of 25 August was the first time that American readers were presented with this astonishing story.

Magazines

Earlier this year, the leading Zionist organization in Great Britain, The Board of Deputies of British Jews, issued a protest at an article in *History Today*, a leading part-work monthly. The January 1980 issue contained a feature entitled "A Nazi Travels to Palestine" describing interface between the Nazi Government and the Zionists in Palestine during the war. The article was written by a Jew, Dr. Jacob Boas, but explored a seam of history which the Board felt was better left un-exploited. Another Jewish historian, Dr. Geoffrey Alderman, leaped to Boas' defense, and issued a statement:

> The action taken by the Board in relation to the article is, in my view, another reflection of a dangerous anti-intellectualism which pervades the Anglo-Jewish establishment and which is marked by a refusal to face realities or to have cherished beliefs questioned dispassionately: the belief in this case being, I suppose, that Jews and Nazis could not possibly have ever had anything in common. I have read the article and, as a Jew, a Zionist, and, may I add, a professional historian, I do not take exception to it at all. As for the protests being made by the Board about the way in which the article was advertised, this is really too petty to require further comment.
>
> *Jewish Chronicle*
> 4 January 1980

Professor Alderman himself came under fire from the Deputies in 1978 for revealing in a letter to the London Times that some Jews voted for the National Front. He was "severely condemned" by the Deputies for "publicly revealing" sensitive findings. However, he still retains his part-time post as a member of the Research Committee of the Board of Deputies.

Photos

The area of photography is worth a whole book in itself.

As Udo Walendy shows in his *Faked Atrocities* (IHR, $5.00) many "atrocity" pictures have been forged or arbitrarily captioned. The Institute for Historical Review is currently compiling a dossier of pictures which are recycled throughout many Exterminationist books with a different description as caption each time. These findings will be published later. But for now, what better description of the uses of fake photography could we have but that put forward by *Exterminationiste* Lucy Dawidowicz in her article "Visualizing the Warsaw Ghetto: Nazi Images of the Jews, Refiltered by the BBC" which was published in *SHOAH: A Review of Holocaust Studies and Commemorations*, University of Bridgeport, CT 06602:

> Nowadays we live in an era of photomania, where photographs are regarded as the magic key to unlock the doors of the past, which only the most effortful study of history had previously been able to open. Nowadays people regard pictures as the essence of truth, forgetting that, like written documents, the camera falsifies objective reality because it creates its own illusion of reality. Too often pictures have been made to serve the uses of propaganda. Selective photography, posed or staged subject matter, technical tricks of the trade which bring into existence nonexistant subjects—these are the standard ways the camera is made to lie. Too often the camera serves ends that contribute neither to the truth of art nor to the truth of history.
>
> (*sic!*)

Toys

The Zionists' thought control even extends into the kindergarten. A two-year campaign by the American Jewish Congress has resulted in the deletion of war toys bearing swastikas by American toy manufacturers. Revell of Venice, CA and Lindberg of Skokie, IL were the first to "suspend the manufacture of swastika-emblazoned toys" and the largest manufacturer, Mattel of Hawthorne, CA, were soon to follow. The AJC's Director, Julius Schatz, gloated:

> We consider the Mattel action to be a major victory in our effort to discourage the production of toy tanks, planes, ships, and other military objects carrying the symbol of destruction of six million Jews and millions of others. Mattel's announcement vindicates our stance. . . No badge or symbol in human history is as foul a reminder of bestiality as the swastika. Yet these insignia of blood lust, of human skin made into lampshades, of millions of men and women and children slaughtered like cattle, are emblazoned on toys that are sold by the million to American children. . . It is also a matter of safeguarding young and vulnerable children from the taint of war toys with swastikas, playing war games that will simulate the Nazi war machine.
>
> *B'nai B'rith Messenger*
> 15 June 1979

Thus, at a stroke, Toytown history is re-written, with the deletion of one of the most essential aspects of any playroom or sandbox battle scenario: The Bad Guys. Mr Schatz has not only ensured that impressionable American youngsters will be unable to re-enact the Nürnburg Rallies, with flypasts of squadrons of swastika-emblazoned Stukas and Messerschmidts, nor indeed the Munich *putsch*, with "the insignia of blood lust" flaunted on the sides of Nazi *Personenwagen*, but he has also determined that The Good Guys in the battle scenes will be fighting with. . .Other Good Guys!

Presumably the ADL and other Zionists adopt this patronizing attitude to us adults as well. It would appear by all evidence that they regard us intellectually as children in a sandbox who need to be protected from things that might influence our impressionable, vulnerable, little brains. It remains to be seen, how much longer American academics are prepared to tolerate this situation. As a consortium of Civil Liberties organizations pontificated in an *amicus curiae* suit filed against the School Board of Warsaw, IN recently:

> The public school should be a vibrant, free market of ideas. Indeed, if the "right to read and be exposed to controversial thoughts" cannot flourish anywhere in the school house, the prospects are bleak that it will ever flourish anywhere

in society.

(*sic*, *sic*, and *sic* again!)

Unfortunately, this high-minded idea does not appeal to our old friend Yaakov Riz, whose basement Holocaust Museum we mentioned on page 132 of our Summer 1980 issue. Mr. Riz wrote to the *Jewish Press* on 5 September 1980 to point out how "the Talmud teaches us how to use Visual Propaganda." He quotes a passage from the Talmud where the Angels Gabriel and Michael tricked God into drowning the wicked Egyptians by showing him an Egyptian brick and a dead Jewish child. Riz vigorously advocates using the same trickery to combat the wicked "Arabs, Nazis and Communists" who otherwise are "winning their filthy hate campaign against Israel and American Jewry." One wonders what Talmudic trickery Riz and his cohorts have used already?

The Japanese Camps in California

MARK WEBER

In the months following the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor, many expected an immediate attack against the West Coast. Fear gripped the country and a wave of hysterical antipathy against the Japanese engulfed the Pacific Coast.

The FBI quickly began rounding up any and all "suspicious" Japanese for internment. None was ever charged with any crime. Almost all were simply Japanese community leaders, Buddhist or Shinto priests, newspaper editors, language or Judo instructors, or labor organizers. The Japanese community leadership was liquidated in one quick operation.

Men were taken away without notice. Most families knew nothing about why their men had suddenly disappeared, to where they were taken, or when they would be released. Some arrestees were soon let free, but most were secretly shipped to internment camps around the country. Some families learned what had happened to their men only several years later. The action also included the freezing of bank accounts, seizure of contraband, drastic limitation on travel, curfew and other severely restrictive measures. But this FBI operation merely set the stage for the mass evacuation to come.

In February 1942, Lt. Gen. John L. DeWitt, Commanding General of the Western Defense Command, requested authorization from Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson to evacuate "Japanese and other subversive persons" from the West Coast area. On 19 February, President Franklin Roosevelt signed Executive Order No. 9066 authorizing the Secretary of War or any military commander to establish "military areas" and to exclude from them "any or all persons."

A month later, President Roosevelt signed Executive Order No. 9102 establishing the War Relocation Authority, which eventually operated the internment camps. Roosevelt named Milton Eisenhower, brother of the future president, to head the WRA.

Without a murmur of dissent, the Congress quickly affirmed Executive Order 9066 with the passage of Public Law 77-503.

Beginning in March, the Army organized the evacuation of some 77 000 U.S. citizens of Japanese origin ("Nisei") and 43 000 mostly older Japanese citizens ("Issei") from California and parts of Washington, Oregon and Arizona.

Posters appeared the length of the West Coast ordering the Japanese to evacuation points. "Instructions to all persons of JAPANESE ancestry," read the bold headline on a typical poster. The text read: "All Japanese persons, both alien and non-alien, will be evacuated from the above designated areas by 12:00 o'clock noon Tuesday, April 7, 1942." * The evacuees were told to report for internment with bedrolls and only as much baggage as could be carried by hand. (A postwar survey showed that 80 percent of the privately stored goods belonging to the interned Japanese were "rifled, stolen or sold during absence.")

The 23 000 Japanese living on the West Coast of Canada, three-fourths of whom were Canadian citizens, were also rounded up. They were not permitted back into British Columbia until March 1949, seven years after the evacuation and three and a half years after the end of the war.

The State Department told the Latin American countries to round up their Japanese. The United States paid for the cost of the hemispheric evacuation. Over 2000 Japanese were shipped from more than a dozen Latin American countries to detention camps in the United States. Most were sent by Peru, which wanted to permanently eliminate all Japanese and refused to allow reentry of those held in the U.S. after the end of the war.

Brazil, Uruguay and Paraguay set up their own internment camp programs. To their credit, Argentina and Chile did not break diplomatic relations with the Axis until late in the war, and only then under tremendous U.S. pressure. As

a result, their Japanese were not rounded up.

The rationale for the West Coast evacuation was "military necessity." But that claim was inconsistent with the fact that the Japanese living on Hawaii were not subject to mass incarceration. Hawaii was in far greater danger of invasion that the West Coast. The population of Hawaii was 38 percent Japanese, as compared to only about one percent in California. All except a small percentage of the Hawaiian Japanese remained free to keep the important island economy functioning.

The evacuation, ostensibly to protect against possible sabotage and espionage, moreover included babies, orphans, adopted children, and the infirm or bedridden elderly. Children of mixed blood, even from orphanages, were included if they had any Japanese ancestry at all. Colonel Karl Bendetsen, who directly administered the program, declared: "I am determined that if they have one drop of Japanese blood in them, they must go to camp."

It should be noted that throughout the war, members of the Communist Party actively worked to promote the interests of a foreign power and an international organization committed to the overthrow of the constitutional government of the United States. But the Communists in America were not only not restricted, they were openly encouraged and supported.

The U.S. government told Americans that our detention centers had nothing in common with the horrible concentration camps established by the enemy in Europe. The Army public relations agency continually referred to the centers as "resettlement camps" and "havens of refuge." The State Department denied that the centers were concentration camps, " . . .but are on the contrary areas where communities are being established in which the Japanese may organize their social and economic life in safety and security under the protection of the central authorities of the United States." In a public relations piece which appeared in the September 1942 issue of *Harper's*, a military official writing under a false name told Americans that "In the long run the Japanese will probably profit by this painful and distressing experience."

A total of 120 000 were ultimately detained in the ten permanent mass detention camps built by the government. Were these internment centers really concentration camps? Chief Judge William Denman of the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals described the Tule Lake camp this way:

> The barbed-wire stockade surrounding the 18 000 people there was like that of the prison camps of the Germans. There were the same turrets for the soldiers and the same machine guns for those who might attempt to climb the high wiring . . .
>
> The buildings were covered with tarred paper over green and shrinking shiplap—this for the low winter temperatures of the high elevation of Tule Lake . . . No federal penitentiary so treats its adult prisoners. Here were the children and babies as well.
>
> . . . To reach the unheated latrines, which were in the center of the blocks of fourteen buildings, meant leaving the residential shacks and walking through the rain and snow—again a lower than penitentiary treatment, even disregarding the sick and the children.
>
> So also was the crowding of the 18 000 people in the one-storey shacks . . . In the cells of a federal penitentiary there is no such crowding. (Weglyn, p156)

The Army used six tanks and a battalion of military police (899 men and 31 officers) to guard the Japanese at Tule Lake, California. Several camps had electrically charged fencing, which made little sense since all the camps were invariably located in deserts or other remote and desolate areas. Every camp had searchlights which played over the living quarters at night.

Dozens of inmates were shot and wounded. Eight were killed by guards. Japanese were sometimes brutally beaten and seriously injured without reason. At Tule Lake, guards beat inmates with baseball bats.

When Japanese organized a protest demonstration at Manzanar camp in California, soldiers threw tear gas grenades on the crowd and fired into it. One imnate was killed instantly and another died later. Nine were injured.

Some Japanese committed suicide out of despair and many more died prematurely due to harsh conditions.

Three generations often lived in a single bare room, 20 by 24 feet, which comprised a "family apartment." Sometimes two or three families were crowded into a single such room. The only fixture was a hanging light bulb, except for whatever furniture the inmates could construct for themselves. In some assembly areas, families were assigned to rudely converted horse stables where the stench became oppressive in the summer heat.

All incoming and outgoing mail was censored. All internal communications were strictly controlled. The Japanese language was banned at public meetings and Japanese religious services were suppressed.

The inmates were forced to salute the flag, sing patriotic songs, and declare their allegiance to "one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

One of the most significant aspects of this act of racist repression is the fact the it was *not* the work of a clique of fascists and right-wing militarists, who according to liberal dogma are invariably behind such deeds. Rather, it was advocated, justified and administered by men well known for their support of liberalism and democracy.

Given the almost universal condemnation of the Japanese internment program today, it is hard to realize just how solid support was for it at the time. The vast operation, as one writer points out, was "initiated by the generals, advised, ordered and supervised by the civilian heads of the War Department, authorized by the President, implemented by Congress, approved by the Supreme Court, and supported by the people." (Ten Broek, p325)

The first public call to intern the Japanese seems to have been made at the beginning of January 1942 by John B. Hughes, a prominent radio commentator of the Mutual Broadcasting Company. Shortly thereafter, Henry McLemore, syndicated columnist of the Hearst newspapers told his readers:

> I am for immediate removal of every Japanese on the West Coast to a point deep in the interior. I don't mean a nice part of the interior either. Herd 'em up, pack 'em off and give 'em

> the inside room in the badlands. Let 'em be pinched, hurt, hungry and dead up against it . . .
>
> Personally, I hate the Japanese. And that goes for all of them. (Ten Broek, p75)

Popular movie actor Leo Carillo telegrammed his Congressman:

> Why wait until (the Japanese) pull something before we act . . . Let's get them off the coast and into the interior . . . May I urge you in behalf of the safety of the people of California to start action at once. (Ten Broek, p77)

In February a delegation of West Coast Congressmen sent a letter to the President calling for the "immediate evacuation of all persons of Japanese lineage . . . aliens and citizens alike" from the Pacific coast.

Speaking to southern California on a Lincoln's birthday radio broadcast, Fletcher Bowron, reform Mayor of Los Angeles, denounced the "sickly sentimentality" of those who worried about injustices to the Japanese living in the United States. He told his radio audience that if Abraham Lincoln were alive, he would round up "the people born on American soil who have secret loyalty to the Japanese Emperor."

"There isn't a shadow of a doubt," Bowron told his listeners, "but that Lincoln, the mild-mannered man whose memory we regard with almost saint-like reverence, would make short work of rounding up the Japanese and putting them where they could do no harm."

Walter Lippmann, probably the country's most influential liberal columnist, strongly supported mass evacuation in a February syndicated piece entitled "The Fifth Column on the Coast." Conservative counterpart Westbrook Pegler followed suit a few days later.

Only a week after Pearl Harbor, Mississippi Congressman John Rankin told the House of Representatives:

> I'm for catching every Japanese in America, Alaska and Hawaii now and putting them in concentration camps and shipping them back to Asia as soon as possible . . . This is a race war, as far as the Pacific side of the conflict is concerned . . . The White man's civilization has come into con-

> flict with Japanese barbarism . . . One of them must be destroyed . . . Damn them! Let's get rid of them now! (Ten Broek, p87)

Another member of Congress proposed mandatory sterilization of the Japanese.

All of these statements were quite in keeping with popular sentiment. Immediately after Pearl Harbor, Japanese were excluded from various labor unions. Between 8 December and 31 March, anti-Japanese rage resulted in 36 cases of vigilantism, including seven murders. And a March 1942 national public opinion poll showed 93 percent in favor of evacuating alien Japanese. While 59 percent wanted to evacuate U.S. citizens of Japanese origin, only 25 percent disapproved.

A great deal was made of the fact that immigrants born in Japan, but living for decades in the United States (the *Issei*), had not become U.S. citizens—proof of their continued loyalty to the Emeror. But no mention was made of the fact that long-standing American law forbade them from taking out U.S. citizenship—a ban that was not lifted until 1952!

Since the war, the myth has been that powerful racist anti-Japanese groups engineered the evacuation to remove their economic competitors. But the truth is something quite different. While many White small-businessmen urged evacuation, big business interests did not. More importantly, the Japanese were evacuated at a moment when the country was willing to support whatever measures the Federal government authorized in the name of winning the war.

The fact is that the Japanese were sent to concentration camps not by a group of West Coast racists seeking economic advantage, but by a popular and powerful government run by democratic liberals. At the top of the list of those responsible for not only authorizing the program, but also for keeping it in operation was President Franklin Roosevelt.

Before the President promulgated Executive Order 9066, Attorney General Francis Biddle told Roosevelt that security interests did not justify evacuating the Japanese. The Attorney General's office also determined that the proposed evacuation would be a violation of the Constitution.

The dean of American Revisionist historians, Prof. James J. Martin, called the incarceration program "a breach of the Bill of Rights on a scale so large as to beggar the sum total of all such violations from the beginning of the United States down to that time." (Weglyn, p67)

Roosevelt authorized, supported and maintained an action which he knew to be racist and blatantly unconstitutional. But this was only one more sterling example of the gross hypocrisy which characterized his entire regime.

The man responsible for implementing the evacuation, Lt. Gen. DeWitt, declared:

> In the war in which we are now engaged, racial affinities are not severed by migration. The Japanese race is an enemy race and while many second and third generation Japanese born on United States soil, possessed of United States citizenship, have become "Americanized," the racial strains are undiluted . . . It therefore follows that along the vital Pacific Coast over 112 000 potential enemies of Japanese extraction are at large today. (Ten Broek, pp4, 110, 337 n.6)

Secretary of War Henry L. Stimson was more succinct: "Their racial characteristics are such that we cannot understand or trust even the citizen Japanese."

Another man, well known for his liberal outlook, who helped implement the evacuation and internment was Assistant Secretary of War John J. McCloy. For four years he served as War Department liaison with the War Relocation Authority, the agency which ran the camps. After the war, McCloy was named High Commissioner for Germany. As the highest civilian allied occupation official, McCloy worked to impose democratic rule on the defeated German people.

Chief of the civilian staff of the Western Defense Command and liaison between the WDC and the Justice Department was Tom Clark, who later became an Attorney General and a liberal Supreme Court Justice. In 1966 Clark admitted: "I have made a lot of mistakes in my life, but there are two that I acknowledge publicly, One is my part in the evacuation of Japanese from California in 1942 and the other is the Nürnberg trials."

Abe Fortas was another liberal destined for the Supreme Court who joined in the campaign to intern the Japanese.

Perhaps the most surprising advocate of evacuation was Earl Warren. Considering his later career as a vociferous liberal, it is at least ironic that, more than any other person, Warren led the popular sentiment to uproot and incarcerate the Japanese. As Attorney General of California, Warren cultivated popular racist feeling in an apparent effort to further his political career. He was an outstanding member of the xenophobic "Native Sons of the Golden West," an organization dedicated to keeping California "as it has always been and God Himself intended it shall always be—the White Man's Paradise." The "Native Sons" worked "to save California from the yellow-Jap peaceful invaders and their White-Jap co-conspirators."

In February 1942, Warren testified before a special Congressional committee on the Japanese question. He would be running for Governor of the state that year, and would be elected. Warren testified, falsely, that the Japanese had "infiltrated themselves into every strategic spot in our coastal and valley counties." In one of the most amazing feats of logic ever performed by a lawyer, Warren next claimed that the very fact that no Japanese had so far committed any disloyal act was proof that they intended to do so in the future!

Later, when the government began to release Japanese whose loyalty was above suspicion, Governor Warren protested that every citizen so released had to be kept out of California as a potential saboteur.

Earl Warren played to popular racism to further his political career. Later, as Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, he presided over the consumately liberal "Warren Court" which ushered in an era of racial "equality" and unprecedented racial chaos following the 1954 Brown decision.

After the Japanese had been evacuated, very few wanted them back. Newspaper columnist Elsie Robinson threatened to "cut the throat" of any evacuee who dared return. U.S. Representative Clair Engle of California declared: "We don't want those Japs back in California and the more we

can get rid of the better." A poll conducted by a Los Angeles newspaper in late 1943 showed that Californians would vote ten to one against letting citizens of Japanese origin ever return to normal life from the camps.

In the six months following the end of the evacuation program there were some 30 attacks by West Coast people against returning inmates. Near Fresno and other places, night riders shot into the homes of newly returned families. Anti-Japanese organizations sprang up in the Northwest and in California.

Opposition to evacuation was virtually non-existent. J. Edgar Hoover, head of the FBI, strongly protested against the program. The man whom liberals vilified as the personification of reaction and incipient American Fascism believed that the evacuation hysteria was "based primarily upon public political pressure rather than upon factual data." The FBI, he said, was fully capable of handling the small number of suspects then under surveillance. (Weglyn, p284, n.6)

Liberal California Governor Culbert L. Olson, Warren's predecessor, had a special reason for opposing the program. He proposed instead keeping adult Japanese men in state-run work camps in inland rural areas to harvest crops. If the Japanese were removed from harvest work, Culbert feared that " . . . inundation of the state by Blacks and Chicanos would be unavoidable . . ." (Weglyn, p94)

Perhaps the only honest personality in this whole story was Norman Thomas, the American socialist leader. He was at least non-hypocritical, if not actually heroic. Thomas had been an outspoken and effective leader in the movement to keep America out of the Second World War. He was the only personality of national stature to vehemently oppose the evacuation program. Thomas denounced the policy of the American Civil Liberties Union, which he had cofounded. The ACLU decided that the evacuation fell within the proper limits of the President's power. "What is perhaps as ominous as the evacuation of the Japanese," Thomas retorted, "is the general acceptance of this procedure by those who are proud to call themselves liberals."

This rare "honest liberal" was dismayed at the general

toleration of the program. "In an experience of nearly three decades," Thomas wrote,

> I have never found it harder to arouse the American public on any important issue than on this. Men and women who know nothing of the facts (except possibly the rose-colored version which appears in the public press) hotly deny that there are concentration camps. Apparently that is a term to be used only if the guards speak German and carry a whip as well as a rifle. (Weglyn, pp111-12)

The Supreme Court ruled on three cases relating to the evacuation program. In *Hirabayashi* v. *U.S.* (1943) the high court unanimously upheld a conviction for violating a curfew directed against a population group distinguished solely by racial-national ancestry.

The case of *Korematsu* v. *U.S.* (1944) involved a *Nisei* (U.S. citizen) who refused to submit to evacuation. Chief Justice Hugo Black, speaking for the majority of six, upheld the validity of the program. Ignoring the constitutional guarantees of due process and equal protection of the law, the Court decided that one group of citizens may be singled out, uprooted from their homes, and sent to camps for several years without trial based solely on ancestry.

Finally, at the end of 1944, in the case of *Ex Parte Endo*, the Court ruled unanimously that the government had no right to detain admittedly loyal U.S. citizens indefinitely. This decision ended the entire program. Within 48 hours of the ruling, the government announced that, apart from a few suspicious individuals, the Japanese were free to return home.

Comparisons have often been made between the Second World War concentration camps in America with those in Germany, although Topaz, Poston, and Gila River have never become as well known as Buchenwald, Bergen-Belsen and Dachau. Starvation and disease epidemics never ravaged the camps in this country as they did in Germany.

In America, economic and social life remained basically intact throughout the war. The great cities here were spared annihilation under showers of bombs. No hordes of foreign invaders poured across the American frontiers. The

U.S. government could run its concentration camps on a virtual peace-time basis.

The German situation was completely different. In the final months of the war, Germany was waging a losing struggle for naked existence. The social-economic system collapsed completely in the face of total military defeat. The horrendous scenes photographed in the German camps by the Allied conquerors and distributed as propaganda around the world resulted from the starvation and disease that reigned unchecked throughout Europe as a consequence of the military catastrophe.

At the Nürnberg show trials, the German defendants compared the evacuation of the Jews of Europe and the deportation of the West Coast Japanese. In both cases, the programs were allegedly based upon "military necessity." The Nürnberg defendants cited the *Korematsu* and *Hirabayashi* decisions. The latter Supreme Court decision was specifically based "upon the recognition of facts and circumstances which indicate that a group of one national extraction may menace the safety more than others . . ."

Actually, the Germans had far greater cause to intern the Jews of Europe than the Americans did to incarcerate the West Coast Japanese. The Japanese were sent to camps solely on suspicion of what they might do. Not a single Japanese had committed an act of espionage or sabotage. But many thousands of Jews throughout Europe had committed countless acts of murder, destruction, sabotage, arson and theft before the Germans began their general evacuation.

The Germans, moreover, had greater legal justification for their policy. The great majority of the Japanese internees were U.S. citizens and legally entitled to equal protection under the law. The Jews of Germany had not been full citizens for several years before the war began. Elsewhere in Europe, the Jews were evacuated from militarily occupied territories or by countries allied with Germany.

The post-war mass media has spent years hammering away at the "guilt" of the German people for generally doing nothing while the Jews were being evacuated to the East. How does the German experience compare with the American record of popular enthusiasm for evacuating the

West Coast Japanese?

Since the war, the Germans have paid over tens of billions of dollars in restitution to Jewish organizations, the state of Israel and to individual Jews around the world for "those who suffered in mind and body, or had been deprived unjustly of their freedom." But no American concentration camp inmate has ever received a penny for hardship, humiliation or income lost during the years of internment.

That did not stop the United States government from recently insisting that the East Germans must pay restitution to Jews who were and are not even American citizens. The U.S. government designated a private American Jewish organization to "negotiate" with the German Democratic Republic for payments to Jews living around the world.

The German defendants at Nürnberg were declared guilty of "crimes against humanity" for, among other things, victimizing members of a group on the basis of ancestry. What responsibility did the countries, including the United States, which set up the International Military Tribunal have in upholding that principle in their own territories? Why have no Americans ever been called to account for committing the same "crimes" for which Germans were put to death in Nürnberg?

Bibliography

Bosworth, Allan R., *America's Concentration Camps*, New York, 1967.

Japanese American Citizens League, *The Japanese American Incarceration: A Case for Redress*, San Francisco, 1978.

Myer, Dillon S., *Uprooted Americans* (The Japanese Americans and the War Relocation Authority During World War II) Tucson, AZ, 1971.

Petersen, William, "The Incarceration of the Japanese-Americans," *National Review*, 8 December 1972, pp1349ff.

Spicer, Edward H., A.T. Hansen, K. Luomala, M.K. Opler, *Impounded People* (Japanese-Americans in the Relocation Centers), Tucson, AZ, 1969.

Ten Broek, Jacobus, E.H. Barnhart, F.W. Matson, *Prejudice, War and the Constitution*, Berkeley, 1968.

Weglyn, Michi, *Years of Infamy* (The Untold Story of America's Concentration Camps), New York, 1976.

* Facsimile reproductions of this poster are available from the IHR at $1.00. The usual bulk discounts apply.

The European Volunteer Movement in World War II

RICHARD LANDWEHR

They called themselves the "assault generation" and they had largely been born in the years during and after World War I. Coming from every nation of Europe, they had risen up against the twin hydra of communism and big capitalism and banded together under one flag for a common cause. Fully a million of them joined the German Army in World War II, nearly half of them with the *Waffen-SS*. And it was in the *Waffen-SS*, the elite fighting force of Germany, where the idea of a united, anti-communist Europe became fully developed.

It was also in the *Waffen-SS* where a new society emerged from among the "front fighters" of thirty different nations. It was a society that had been forged in the sacrifice, sweat and blood of the battlefield and that propagated the concept of "one new race," the European race, wherein language and national differences counted for little, while the culture of each nation was taken for granted as a common heritage. Many countries sent more volunteers into the *Waffen-SS* than they could raise for their own national armies, so something truly phenomenal was taking place.

The *Waffen-SS* itself was something unusually special. It had started out as a small-sized personal bodyguard for Adolf Hitler but had gradually expanded into a full-scale military force under the guidance of a number of disgruntled former army officers who saw the *Waffen-SS* as a chance to break out from the conservative mold that the German Army had become mired in. The *Waffen-SS* was designed from the start to be a highly mobile assault force whose soldiers were well versed in the art of handling mod-

ern, close-combat weapons. The training regimen therefore resembled that given to special commandos in other countries, but it pre-dated U.S. and British commando training by nearly a decade.

The soldiers of the *Waffen-SS* were also the first to utilize the camouflage battle dress that was to later become so common. But in one field, that of internal personnel organization, the *Waffen-SS* has yet to be imitated much less surpassed. The *Waffen-SS* was probably the most "democratic" armed force in modern times. Rigid formality and class structure between officers and other ranks was strictly forbidden. An officer held down his position only because he had proven himself a better soldier than his men, not because of any rank in society, family connections or superior academic education. In sports—one of the vital cogs in the *Waffen-SS* training programs—officers and men competed as equals in an atmosphere that sponsored team work and mutual respect and reliance. Non-German volunteers of whatever nationality were not regarded as inferiors; they were judged on their ability and performance as soldiers.

The idea to actively recruit foreign nationals into the *Waffen-SS* came shortly after the outcome of the Polish Campaign of 1939, when *SS* units were being formed and enlarged and it was noticed that a great many men (usually of German extraction) from foreign countries were volunteering for service. The fact that *Waffen-SS* recruitment among Germans was restricted by the *Wehrmacht*, made these "out country" volunteers all the more desirable. Since Western Europe contained many sympathizers and admirers of Germany and its National Socialist government, the *SS* decided to create three new regiments ("Nordland," "Westland," "Nordwest") for Dutch, Flemish, Danish and Norwegian volunteers in the spring of 1940. There was at this time, little in the way of a cohesive, Pan-European ideal to follow, but thousands of recruits turned up anyway, primarily out of disgust for the performances of their respective socialist/pacifist governments.

For many there was additional incentive. In Belgium, Holland and France, scores of populist and right-wing political figures had been arrested, incarcerated and beaten,

and shot-out-of-hand. The most famous single incident occurred in Abbeville, France in May 1940, when French police lined up 22 leading Belgian right-wing leaders and executed them in a public park shortly before the arrival of the Germans. It was certainly a "war crime"—one of the first in fact to be committed and documented in World War II—but try to find it in a history text book! The establishment historians have shied away from any discussion of this event. Following this massacre, many of the followers of the victims flocked to join the new volunteer regiments of the *Waffen-SS.*

The war with the Soviet Union, commencing in June 1941, brought a new direction to the effort to attract European volunteers in what can be called "The Legionary Movement."

The Legionary Movement

The "Legionary Movement" was an attempt to attract qualified military personnel from various countries who otherwise would not have considered engagement with the German Armed Forces, by appealing to their national pride and anti-communist convictions. The *Waffen-SS* undertook the task of forming Legions from "Germanic" countries, while the *Wehrmacht*, or German Army proper, was given responsibility over Latin and Slavic Legions. The national Legions proved to be a success, but for a number of reasons —primarily "cost efficiency," redundancy with *Waffen-SS* elements and size factor—were not worth perpetuating in the same format. The primary West European Legions were as follows:

Volunteer Legion Norwegen: This was an 1150 man reinforced battalion that served with distinction on the Leningrad Front and around Lake Ilmen. It later served as the nucleus of the 23rd SS Regiment "Norge." On the home front it was supported by numerous political figures and celebrities including the famous opera singer Kirsten Flagstad and Nobel-Prize winning author, Knut Hamsun. Hamsun was an honorary member of the Legion and actually wore a Legion uniform. His son served with the Legion and the *Waffen-SS*

and was decorated with the Iron Cross, second class.

Volunteer Legion Flandern: This was initially a 900 man battalion later increased to 1116 men that served around Lake Ilmen under the 2nd SS Brigade and at times with the 4th SS Police Division and the Spanish "Blue" Division. It acquitted itself splendidly, obtaining mention in the *Wehrmacht* war bulletin among other honors. Its supreme moment came in March 1943 when it recovered a lost regimental frontline sector from the Soviets in a bold attack and held onto the regained positions for a week against all odds. By the end of the engagement the "Legion Flandern" had been reduced to a net strength of 45 men! Equal numbers of Flemings served with the 5th SS Division "Wiking" and the Volunteer Regiment "Nordwest." Eventually these contingents were merged with new recruits to form the Storm Brigade "Langemarck."

Volunteer Legion Niederlande: The was a 2600 man regiment and component of the 2nd SS Brigade on the Leningrad front. "Niederlande" swiftly obtained a reputation for valor and achievement. In June 1942, Legionaires succeeded in capturing the commander of the 11th Soviet Army and 3500 of his soldiers. One enlisted man, *Sturmann* Gerardus Mooyman became the first West European volunteer to receive the Knight's Cross decoration after singlehandedly destroying 14 Soviet tanks in one day in February 1943. The Legion later formed the basis for the "Nederland" Brigade and division.

Freikorps Danmark: This was an 1164 man reinforced battalion that served with considerable distinction in the Demyansk Pocket alongside the 3rd SS Division "Totenkopf." For a time it was let by the swashbuckling Christian Frederick von Schalburg, a Ukrainian-Danish count who met a soldier's death in the frontlines. The "Freikorps" was authorized and fully supported by the govvernment of Denmark. After the war, members of the "Freikorps Danmark" were prosecuted as "traitors" with the Danish government evading responsibility by saying that the volunteers should have known that the government was merely "acting under duress" when it set up the "Freikorps" and signed the Anti-Comintern pact. Later the "Freikorps"

formed the nucleus of the 24th SS Regiment "Danmark."

Finnish Volunteer Battalion of the Waffen-SS: This was a 1000 man unit that served as a component part of the "Nordland" Regiment of the SS "Wiking" Division. Its greatest moment came in October 1942, when the Finns were able to seize Hill 711 near Malgobek in the south Caucausus in a daring frontal assault. Other Berman units had repeatedly tried to do the same thing but had failed. The Finns served in the *Waffen-SS* at the discretion of their government, which in June 1943 thought it would be more discreet to transfer the Battalion from the *Waffen-SS* to the Finnish Army.

The principal *Wehrmacht* Legions were the following:

The French Volunteer Legion Against Communism: It served as the 638th Regiment with the 7th German Infantry Division, participated in the drive on Moscow and fought well whenever it was deployed. It was largely transferred into the *Waffen-SS* in 1944.

Legion Wallonie: This was organized as a mountain-infantry battalion. It was formed by the SS from the French-speaking Belgians (Walloons) and was taken over by the *Wehrmacht* in late 1941 so as not to offend the "Germanic" Flemings already serving in the *Waffen-SS*. It fought exceptionally well in the campaign through the Caucausus Mountains alongside the SS Division "Wiking." It contained many former Belgian Army Officers and the famous political leader Leon Degrelle, who exhibited a flare for death-defying heroics. It was finally re-transferred back into the *Waffen-SS* in June 1943 at Degrelle's request and was reformed as an assault brigade.

Croatian Legion: This was a regiment that fought on the southern part of the eastern front with considerable valor and was totally annihilated in Stalingrad. It was later replaced by three full-scale divisions.

Spanish Legion: This was the independent 250th Infantry Division of the "Spanish Blue" Division that fought with incredible heroism on the Lake Ilmen Front. After it was withdrawn from the eastern front in August 1943 by Franco, survivors carried on in a Spanish SS Legion that fought until the end of the war.

Per Sorensen: Portrait of a Legionary

The 27 year old Danish Army Lieutenant Per Sorensen (formerly Adjutant of the Viborg Battalion) was the ideal model of what the Germans were looking for when they launched the Legionary Movement. On 1 July 1941, Sorensen volunteered for service with the "Freikorps Danmark" motivated by anti-communist feelings and a vague sort of National Socialist attitude. In the autumn nonths he attended the *Waffen-SS* Officer School at Bad Toelz and in the spring of 1942, rejoined the "Freikorps" as commander of the 1st Company.

During the summer months he led his company in the tough back-and-forth fighting that raged in the relief corridor to the Demyansk Pocket. After several engagements, 1st Company had been reduced from over 200 men to only 40. They had to hold a long stretch of front against strong communist forces. On the afternoon of 16 July 1942, Sorensen telephoned "Freikorp's" HQ that he didn't know whether his troops could survive another strong attack but they would stay in position no matter what. That night a Red Army infantry battalion attacked with tank support. The communists were soon in 1st Company's trenches. From sundown to midnight hand-to-hand fighting raged for possession of the positions. Then suddenly it was all over with the Russians either dead or driven out. Thanks to Sorensen's leadership, 1st Company held.

In the years to come, whether in White Russia or Estonia, Lativia or Pomerania, the troops under Sorensen's command would always do the job. Before every action, the tall, slender Dane would make a personal reconnaisance of the terrain and during the fighting he was always as the hottest spots with a machine-pistol dangling from his neck.

To his soldiers, Sorensen had the uncanny habit of attracting the enemy. They passed around the phrase: "Wherever Sorensen is—the Russians will come!" And they usually were right. For his endless solicitude and patience, he received the nickname "På Sorensen" from his men. Time and time again, Sorensen provided the special qualities so vital in a leader. In January 1944, he took over an en-

trapped battalion near Vitino in northern Russia and literally led it to safety by staying at the point of the column on a journey through thick, snow shrouded forests.

After commanding battalions and battlegroups, Sorensen received command of the 24th SS Regiment "Danmark" just to the east of Berlin in April 1945. Finally, the Regiment was reduced to trying to defend a street-car station in the heart of Berlin. While climbing a telephone pole to try and survey the terrain, *Sturmbannführer* (Major) Sorensen was picked off by an enemy sniper. On the next day, in the midst of the desperate, last battle for the German capital, Sorensen was given a military funeral in the Ploetzensee cemetery by Germans and Danes from the "Nordland" Division.

With shells detonating all around, the body of Sorensen was taken to the cemetery in an armored troop carrier. Over the open grave, *Sturmscharführer* (Sgt.) Hermann gave a brief eulogy:

> We are standing here by the graveside to take our last departure from a courageous Danish comrade, the foremost officer and leader of the Regiment "Danmark": Per Sorensen! I must, even in this hour give the thanks of my people for you and your many Danish comrades who have stood so loyally beside us. I would like to express from my heart: may you find peace at last in our bleeding city!

As Hermann spoke, the coffin (constructed from ammunition crates by "Nordland" engineers) was lowered into the grave. Two of the Danish officers attending struggled to contain their emotions. Hermann led a last salute and the eight man honor guard fired three salvos over the grave. A woman flak helper tossed flowers into the grave, and each of the Danish and German soldiers attending passed by throwing in a handful of earth. As the great city shook under rumbling artillery fire and great clouds of smoke obscured the sky, the haunting strains of "I had a Comrade" echoed over Sorensen's grave as the funeral reached its conclusion. The tragic symbolism was complete and fitting: in the very heart of Europe, on its last battlefield, a proto-

typical representative of the European Volunteer Movement had met his end.

The European Movement takes Shape

In 1943, the European Volunteer Movement which had been individually developing in the Legions and the *Waffen-SS* was finally amalgamated and consecrated within the ranks of the *Waffen-SS*. The spiritual citadel of the "Movement" now became the SS Officers' School at Bad Toelz in Bavaria, which in 1943 established its first "class' (or "inspection") exclusively for West European Volunteers. Previously the volunteers had received no specialized treatment but were treated like Germans. Now all of that changed and a sense of European unity with respect for all nationalities and cultures was openly fostered. Within the next two years, *SS-JS* Toelz would produce more than 1000 highly motivated European officers from 12 different countries exclusive of Germany.

Bad Toelz was considered the premier officers' training school in World War II and in addition to a thorough training program that featured live ammunition in most field exercises, it offered well-rounded athletic, cultural and educational opportunities. The great opera, musical and theatrical troops of central Europe made frequent visits while the athletic facilities were unsurpassed in Europe. Twelve different coaches, each one either an Olympic or world class champion in his field, supervised a vast sports program that even included golf and tennis. In the academic arena, freedom of speech was not only permitted but encouraged and the writings of such disparate souls as Marx, Hitler, Jefferson and Churchill were openly discussed and debated.

What Bad Toelz produced was literally a "Renaissance man" who was also a top-notch military officer, In early 1945, the staff and students were mobilized into the newly authorized 38th SS Division "Niebelungen," and one of the great ironies of the war took place: a mostly German division was officered by non-German Europeans (the officer cadets) instead of the other way around. Once in action against the Americans in southern Bavaria, the Scandina-

vians, Lowlanders and Frenchmen found themselves opposing an enemy whom they thought could only have existed on the Eastern Front. Like all of the *Waffen-SS* units to serve in the west in 1945, "Niebelungen" was soon victimized by numerous "war crimes." Entire companies and battalions were bludgeoned and shot to death after going into U.S. captivity. To date this grisly story has only been revealed in bits and pieces and has—naturally enough—been largely suppressed by the Allied side. However, it is interesting to note that some former members of the *Waffen-SS* consider it likely that more of their comrades were killed in American captivity than on the battlefield itself!

1944-45: A European Army at War

The year 1944 opened with the Flemish SS Storm Brigade "Langemarck" fighting a savage retrograde action near Zhitomir in southern Ukraine. Simultaneously the Scandinavian "Nordland" Division and Dutch "Nederland" Brigade were desperately trying to stem a massive Red Army offensive in the Leningrad sector, and the European "Wiking" Division and Belgian Brigade "Wallonien" were going into the "sack" west of Cherkassy. The breakout from the Cherkassy Pocket on the southern Eastern Front was a true epic of heroism: a sacrificial struggle that bound troops of different nationalities firmly together. In the post-war years the survivors have held annual rememberence meetings so that to this day "Cherkassy" remains a living symbol of the European Voluntary Movement.

The spring of 1944 saw the three Baltic SS Divisions fighting with steadfast courage on the eastern boundaries of their countries. In Lithuania, the nucleus for a new SS Division began taking shape under the guidance of former Lithuanian Army generals, but the country was overrun by the communists before the project could be brought to fruition. Against the Anzio beachead in Italy, the first combat ready Italian SS battalion grimly held its ground against all American breakout attempts. All over Europe, manpower was being voluntarily mobilized into the *Waffen-SS* to participate in what many people saw as the forthcoming, decisive struggle for the freedom of the continent.

The summer of 1944 saw the "battle of the European SS" on the Narva Front in Estonia. Here, nationals from Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Flanders, Holland and Estonia shared the trenches and fought shoulder-to-shoulder to throw the Bolsheviks back off "Orphanage Hill" and "Grenadier Hill." Leon Degrelle personally led a battalion from his "Wallonien" Division in a brilliant defensive action near Tartu on the west shore of Lake Peipus. Near Brody in Ukraine, the 14th Ukranian SS Division fought a life-or-death battle to escape from a Soviet encirclement; only about one-fourth of the Division survived the fighting, but they had acquitted themselves well.

As the year went on, more and more foreign volunteer divisions were formed. This meant that flexible leadership was needed to handle the different cultural distinctions and surprisingly, the *Waffen-SS* was equal to the task. Although organized religion was kept separate from the *Waffen-SS*, volunteers from devout Catholic, Moslem, Greek Catholic and Orthodox countries were given total freedom to practice their religions with their own clergy. For morale purposes, ethnic cultural activities were actively encouraged. It was quite a contrast to the way some minority groups were treated in the Allied armies at the time.

Some of the foreign SS divisions composed of Russian and Moslem volunteers had to be disbanded, since the time and personnel needed to develop these units were lacking. By the autumn of 1944 the *Waffen-SS* European volunteer tally sheet contained the following elements: 2 Dutch brigades, 2 Belgian brigades, 1 French brigade and 1 Italian brigade, (all being transformed into divisions), 2 Croat Moslem divisions, 1 Albanian Moslem division, 2 Hungarian divisions with 2 more in the works that never panned out, 2 Scandinavian/German divisions, 2 Latvian divisions, 1 Estonian division, 2 Russian divisions (both of which would later be transferred to the Vlasov Liberation Army), 1 Ukranian division, 1 Italian/German division, 1 Hungarian/German division, 1 Balkan/German division, 1 Serbian division, numerous ethnic brigades from the Soviet Union, and small detachments of Spaniards, Britons, Greeks, Romanians, Bulgarians, Arabs and Indians. The foreign SS units were all

suitably supplied with national badges, insignia and unit distinctions. And while there were many volunteers from such neutral countries as Ireland, Sweden and Switzerland they could not be openly designated as such so as not to offend their respective governments.

On the Eastern Front, the war raged with unending intensity. In White Russia, part of the French SS Storm Brigade fighting with the 18th Hungarian/German SS Division "Horst Wessel," sacrificed itself completely in hard defensive action, losing two-thirds of its personnel in the process. In Estonia, a regiment of Estonian soldiers who had been serving in the Finnish Army returned home to fight for their country. They were reformed into a battalion of the 20th Estonian SS Division and in desperate combat on the Latvian frontier, were virtually annihilated. With grim determination the Latvian 15th and 19th SS Divisions fought the communists for every square foot of their homeland, while in the Carpathian Mountains, the Ukranian Volunteer Division was reassembled.

In Slovenia and Hungary, the brave Moslems of the 13th SS Division "Handschar" performed well against both Tito's partisans and the Red Army, but in France the 30th White Russian SS Division had virtually collapsed while in action against the Americans and French Maquis. These soldiers had only wished to fight the communists and saw no point in what they were doing in the west.

This was not the case in regard to both the 29th Italian SS Division and the 34th Dutch SS Division "Landstorm Nederland." The Italian SS troops fought both the Americans and the rear area communist partisans, and they distinguished themselves as perhaps the best troops that Italy produced during the war. "Landstorm Nederland" first battled the British at Arnhem as part of a hurriedly organized self-defense brigade, but during the winter of 1944-45 it was enlarged into a full-scale 12 000 man infantry division. In the spring of 1945, the almost exclusively Dutch "LN" SS Division gave the British and Canadians fits as they tried with little success to advance into northwest Holland. None of the Allies could figure out why so many Dutchmen chose to join the "Landstorm" Division, so to avoid embarrassment, the

story of this unit has been largely suppressed ever since. For the Dutch volunteers, there was no motivation problem. The Allies had joined with the Bolsheviks against not only their homeland but what they perceived to be European civilization as well. Like their fellow countrymen on the Eastern Front, the men of "Landstorm Nederland" fought with a dedicated resolve.

The Belgian and French SS Divisions were brought up to strength in the fall of 1944 from among the many refugees that had fled to Germany plus veterans of the war with Russia. In Holland, volunteers flocked to the *Waffen-SS* recruiting offices like never before and not because they had to. It didn't take a clairvoyant to see that Germany was virtually finished, but still the European volunteers rushed to join the battle.

The establishment historians have never been able to understand this phenomenon, perhaps because it involved an abstract concept alien to most of them: conscience. There was a great desire for many people, who had until this point sat out the war, to finally be "true to themselves"; to make the ultimate sacrifice out of loyalty to their beliefs, their homelands and their fellow countrymen who had already done so much. This was Europe's moment of crisis and many young men made the decision to leap into the crucible. It was a manifestation of spiritual honesty.

The *Waffen-SS* also managed to project a certain natural attractiveness. Littlejohn, in his book *The Patriotic Traitors* (p123), described the pull of the *Waffen-SS* as follows: "The Runic Flag evoked a heroic pagan spirit, a swaggering defiant attitude to life equally contemptuous of bourgeois timidity and of communist anarchy." The far-sighted Leon Degrelle, who had almost obtained political power in pre-war Belgium also saw a powerful attraction and purpose in the *Waffen-SS*. In his words: "True elites are formed at the front . . . the young leaders are born there . . . the emblem of the SS shows Europe where political and social truth is to be found . . . We are preparing the political cadres of the post-war world in the Great Seminary of the Front Line." A good many volunteers agreed with him.

The end of 1944 saw Leon Degrelle's 28th SS Division "Wallonien" moving into that part of Belgium that had been retaken in the Ardennes Offensive, where it received a hearty welcome and new recruits! But the curtain was rising on the last act on the Eastern Front, and in the weeks ahead most of the European volunteer forces would be in action there. In Kurland, Western Latvia three SS divisions—11th "Nordland," 23rd "Nederland" and 19th Latvian—were caught up in an unequal life-or-death struggle in January 1945. A few extracts from the history of the 49th Dutch SS Regiment "De Ruyter" gave the flavor of the action: (From the series of articles titled "Soldiers of Europe: The *III. SS Panzer Korps*" in *Siegrunen* Magazine)

> After a surging, back-and-forth struggle, the south bastion of Ozoli Hill fell irretrievably to the Russians. The over-pow ered First Co./SS Rgt. "De Ruyter" fell back to the west. *Untersturmführer* Schluifelder, the commander, was badly wounded and shot himself rather than fall into enemy hands.
>
> The Red Army infantry was storming forward. Guided entirely by radio reports, *Obersturmführer* Behler directed the heavy weapons fire of his Dutch gunners at the center of the enemy onslaught. But by mid-day, Behler's positions were entirely surrounded by the enemy. In bloody, close combat, *Obersturmführer* Behler and a few of his men managed to break out to the west.
>
> In the same battle area, Danish *Obersturmführer* Johannes Hellmer's company from Second Battalion/"De Ruyter," was fighting for its life . . . Using his own initiative, *Kanonier* Jenschke, a private, led a small battle group to a successful breakout. Jenschke's rank insignia had been obscured by his camouflage jacket so the men that he had been ordering about were unaware that they outranked him!
>
> During these two days of heavy fighting all of the companies in the main battle line were fully extended. There was nothing to fall back on . . . only 7 men could be spared to defend the whole town of Kaleti . . . This, the defensive struggle of SS Division "Nederland" was the most heroic battle that I have ever lived through. Everyone stayed in position to the finish. The attack came right up to the barrels of our artillery pieces. The firing pits were the main battle line. But although we were weakened and dispersed, we had acquit-

ted ourselves with honor. (This extract from the war diary of *Untersturmführer* Horstmann.)

By the end of the fighting, the SS Regiment "De Ruyter" with a nominal strength of 2000 men had been reduced to 80 combatants! The Regiment was rebuilt on the run and thrown into action again on the Pomeranian Front less than two weeks later. For the first time "De Ruyter" received a Third Battalion, this being composed of Dutch and German war reporters whose jobs had become rather superfluous given recent military reversals.

Remaining in Latvia was the 19th Latvian SS Division, which time and again had proved itself the mainstay of bitter defensive fighting and had received several mentions in the *Wehrmacht* war bulletins. The Latvian volunteers received more decorations than any other non-German group in the *Waffen*-SS, including the award of 13 Knight's Crosses; a good indication of their contributions on the battlefield. In Poland and Silesia, the Hungarian and Estonian SS Divisions were temporarily able to stop the enemy onslaught, even though the commander of the 26th SS Division, "Hungaria," *Oberführer* Zoltan von Pisky had been killed in action at Jarotschin.

As the Eastern Front was pushed slowly westwards, bits and pieces of the 27th Flemish SS Division "Langemarck" were rushed to the Oder River line from various training camps. Here they served alongside their co-national rivals, the Walloons, in a spirit of unbridled comradeship. First Battalion of the 66th SS Regiment/Division "Langemarck" picked up the nickname "leaping tiger" for the way its soldiers threw themselves into battle. But even more amazing was the fact that the battalion was composed mostly of teenagers from the Flemish Hitler Youth who had volunteered for service in the *Waffen*-SS after their country had been overrun by the Allies. If there was one drawback to service in this battalion it was that the regimental quartermaster stubbornly saw that the young troopers received a special ration of *chokalade* and *bon-bons* instead of the

schnapps and cigarettes passed out to the older soldiers!

With a good sense of historical irony, the Eastern Front slowly bent and folded itself around the German capital city of Berlin, throwing a good many of the foreign volunteers into the battle for the city. Regiments of the 15th Latvian SS Division, battered beyond belief, had naively decided to throw in their lot with the western allies against the communists (which proved to be an unfortunate decision for many of the officers who were forcibly repatriated to the death camps), and made a complete circuit of Berlin travelling in no-man's land all the time, until they saw a chance to make it to the American lines. The Division's reconnaissance battalion went out a little too far on a scout mission and wound up being impressed into the defense of the city.

To the north of Berlin, 500 survivors of the 33rd French SS Division "Charlemagne" which had been decimated in the defense of Pomerania, actually volunteered to go to the defense of the German capital, even though the Divisional commander had absolved them from any more service obligations. In the week of the epic battle that followed, these Frenchmen constituted the core of defense in the city center, displaying courage and fortitude on a scale seldom seen. When the fighting was over, only a few dozen would still be alive and four of their number would be decorated with Knight's Cross. One could call their mission a "beau geste," but the French soldiers saw it as a moral obligation—another abstract concept the establishment scholars choke on. The following is a description of these soldiers from the aritlce "Defeat in the Ruins: France's Last Battle for Europe," by Gustav Juergens (*Siegrunen*, June 1980):

> By this time, the warriors of the "Charlemagne" Division didn't even look like human beings any more. Their eyes were burning and their faces skull-like and covered in dirt and mortar dust. Supplies only came in negligible amounts, the most telling being the lack of water. The young SS men moved like robots through the hell of Berlin. The future was the farthest thing from anyone's mind. The only motivating idea that burned in their consciousness and kept them from collapsing was their flaming desire to come to grips with the Bolsheviks! They had to throw hand grenades, destroy

tanks, and hold out against the Reds. That was their only reason for living and for dying.

The SS Divisions "Wallonien," "Nederland" and "Nordland after spearheading the last successful offensive on the Vistula sector to relieve the trapped garrisons at Arneswalde, had been driven inexorably westward. "Nederland" was split into two segments, one being trapped and destroyed in the Halbe Pocket to the south of Berlin and the other retreating to the north of Berlin. Much of the "Nordland" Division, including the staff elements, wound up in Berlin itself.

At Prenzlau, due north of Berlin, the Flemish "Langemarck" Division led by the "leaping tigers" of its Hitler Youth battalion, made the last relief attack against the communist encirclement on 25 April 1945. In violent, savage fighting "Langmarck" was burnt to a cinder along with the "Wallonien" Division and parts of "Charlemagne" and "Nordland"; the survivors were forced to fall back towards the Elbe River. In Silesia, the 20th Estonian SS Division was surrounded and forced to surrender to the Soviets; beginning what for most, would be a long, final journey to the Gulags. One the Austrian frontier, the Ukrainian, Moslem and Cossack SS formations fought with skill and valor before retreating to the west. Most of the Moslems and Cossacks would later be forcibly repatriated to their deaths at the hands of the Yugoslav and Soviet communists; the Ukrainians escaped this real "holocaust" by posing as pre-war Polish citizens.

Going with the Cossacks of 15th SS Army Corps to the Gulags, was their beloved commander, Gen. Lt. Helmuth von Pannwitz, the first foreign national ever to be freely elected Ataman of the Cossack tribes. He chose to share the fate of his men although he could have gone into comfortable Allied internment. In 1947, von Pannwitz, along with the Cossack leaders of the 15th SS Corps, was hanged in Moscow as a "war criminal"; the Cossack soldiers and about one-half million others of their nationality were physically exterminated with the assistance of the United States and Great Britain.

In Italy, after putting up a brave fight, the 29th Italian SS Division surrendered either to the Americans or to the Red partisans and almost to a man, the Italian SS men were put to death. Between 20 000—30 000 of these volunteers were therefore killed outright in captivity. In Yugoslavia another great nightmare unfolded. 10 000 Moslem volunteers from the 13th SS Division "Handschar" were exterminated in a mass execution and their bodies stuffed in an abandoned mine shaft. Many of the soldiers of the 7th SS Mountain Division "Prinz Eugen," recruited from Yugoslav Germans, met a similar fate. In Kurland, Latvia, where a small German Army Group had courageously held out against vastly superior enemy forces until the end of the war, 14 000 members of the 19th Latvian SS Division marched into captivity and oblivion—they were never heard from again.

In Berlin, members of the Spanish SS Legion attempted to breakout of the city wearing pilfered Red Army uniforms; none made it. Those caught by the communists were shot as spies and those intercepted by the Germans were shot as turncoats. When General Krebs went to surrender the Berlin garrison early on the morning of 1 May 1945, he took with him the Latvian *Waffen-Obersturmführer* (1st Lt.) Nielands as an interpreter. After performing his duty, Nielands returned to the command of his 80 man company from the 15th SS Recce Battalion. For the Latvians there would be no surrender—they asked for no quarter from the Soviets and they gave none themselves. In the ruins of the Air Ministry building the Latvian SS troops made their last stand. In hand-to-hand combat they fought to the death.

A few of the volunteers trapped in Berlin actually escaped. The Danish *Obersturmführer* Birkedahl-Hansen, suffering from jaundice, led some men from Regiment "Danmark" successfully out of the city through Spandau to the northwest. They made their way to the seaport of Warnemünde and took a row boat back to Denmark, thus escaping a long trek to Siberia.

The end of the war saw most of the European volunteers frantically trying to make it to the western Allied lines. Surrender, though, only marked the beginning of their problems. The "democratic" governments of the "liberated"

countries were determined to inact a painful vengeance. In each country some of the more prominent volunteers were run through quick "judicial" proceedings and executed, with the others being stripped of their civil rights and sentenced to prison terms of varying lengths. Those that wound up in Soviet hands were either: 1) extradited to their home countries for criminal proceedings or 2) simply shipped to forced labor camps with the Germans. Those that survived up to a decade or so of this treatment were eventually sent home.

The final tally sheet for the European Volunteer Movement ran roughly as follows: (*Waffen-SS* only)

Western Europe: 162 000 volunteers, ranging from about 55 000 in Holland to 80 from Liechtenstein. Out of this total about 50 000 were killed or missing. Included in this figure would be 16 000 Dutchmen and 11 500 Belgians.

Baltic States and Soviet Nationalities: About 250 000 soldiers. Casualties and post-war losses through forced repatriation and execution were enormous.

Balkan and Slavics: About 100 000. Considerable losses.

Ethnic Germans not from Germany: About 300 000.

Germans from the Reich: 400 000. For the Germans and ethnic Germans, losses in killed and missing were about one-third.

In some countries like Holland, the "volunteer" problem was so great, that censorship was imposed, that in most cases remains in place to this day. The Dutch were particularly brutal in treating their military "collaborators"; incarcerating many for long terms in concentration camps that followed the German models faithfully. Many volunteers in the Netherlands subsequently rose to prominence in the political and and business fields, but because of their "background" remained vulnerable to a form of blackmail that has seen some of them (including parliamentary leaders) sent into distant oblivion.

Treatment of returning volunteers was equally harsh in other countries. Belgium executed many both legally and illegally while keeping a majority of their "military collaborators" locked up in concentration camps run in the German

style. In France, some of the more prominent officers were executed, while the rank-and-file of the "Charlemagne" Division was given the option of doing time in Indo-China with the Foreign Legion. Joining them were numerous Hungarian and German SS men who had wound up in French captivity.

Norway locked up its volunteers in stone fortresses and kept them on near starvation rations for between 4 and 8 years. The Norwegian volunteers had sealed their fate when they had offended a "hanging judge" who had offered them modified clemency for admissions of guilt. The judge was spat upon and pelted with rubbish by the incarcerated soldiers so he threw the book at them. Denmark, which produced a multitude of volunteers (nearly 15 000 including the cream of the Danish officer corps), was relatively lenient to most of their soldiers—only the more prominent ones had to suffer for long. One ex-commander of the "Freikorps Danmark" was executed (a decision officially condemned by the Danish Parliament 30 years later), and the Danish Major-General Kryssing, who had comanded a multi-national *ad hoc* division on the Eastern Front, was kept in prison 5 years and deprived of his civil rights.

When the volunteers were mentioned at all after the war, it was always in a very derogatory manner; they were usually referred to as criminals and mercenaries. The Dutch went so far as to hire a psychiatrist to buttress this theory. He interviewed 400 volunteers and later propounded the thesis that these men had not served out of any moral committment but had "sold their souls" for material inducements and adventure. This has been pretty much the establishment line ever since although it is never mentioned that the volunteers interviewed (constituting one-half of one percent of the total number of Danish military collaborators), were quite willing to say anything to secure release from their concentration camp.

If one looks at the rigorous screening process that the Germans applied to their foreign volunteers the myth of their being "criminals" and "mercenaries" is pretty well exploded. The basic criteria for acceptance in the *Waffen-SS* revolved around the applicant's physical fitness, mental attitude and past record. Anyone with a criminal record

was simply not accepted, although some did slip through. Utilizing these standards, the *Waffen-SS* accepted only 3000 recruits out of about 12 000 who flooded the recruiting offices of the original Dutch Legion. And out of this 3000 another 400 would be culled out during training for either harboring a criminal past or an incompatible political attitude. Similarly we can look at the Ukranian volunteers and see that out of 81 999 initial applicants only 29 124 were finally accepted after screening!

If there is any judgement that can be made from this it is that the men who got into the *Waffen-SS* usually represented the best human material that their respective countries had to offer. There is no way to categorize them individually since they came from all different classes and backgrounds sharing only one common denominator: a love of their country and continent.

It is fair to say that the European volunteers left a mark on the battlefields of the Eastern Front far out of proportion to their actual numbers, and this paper would not be complete if it did not include a sampling of their achievements.

In the Linden Hills east of the Oder River, *Obersturmführer* Capelle's company of Walloon volunteers was in its death struggle. Enemy tanks were swarming all over—many had been knocked out but all of the *panzerfauste* were now exhausted. At this point, Capelle radioed to "Wallonien" Division headquarters that he was going to try and breakout and link-up with the Division. But escape for the company was no longer possible. Walloon volunteers were crushed to death by tanks running over their foxholes. The badly wounded fired their weapons until their last breath.

Finally all that was left was the company command post. In a heroic stand, the Belgian SS men fought it out until the end. The severely wounded were humanely put out of their misery. The survivors fought on with rifle butts and service revolvers. Incredibly, the command post resisted for the whole day. As it was finally overwhelmed in the early evening, *Obersturmführer* Capelle went down firing his pistol. Two wounded Walloons reached the German lines during the night to tell of this last battle.

On the next day, 27 February 1945, a supplement to the

daily *Wehrmacht* war bulletin was read over the German radio: "In Pomerania a battle-group from the SS Volunteers Grenadier Division 'Wallonien' under the leadership of SS-*Obersturmführer* Capelle was deployed for flank for flank protection. Displaying exemplary steadfastness and fanatical battle spirit, it was destroyed (in action)." Capelle was recommended for the posthumous award of the Knight's Cross but documentation for the decoration was lost in the chaos of the war's end.

* * *

On the morning of 26 January 1944 a Soviet tank force broke into the town of Gubanizy. The Dutch volunteer Caspar Sporck drove his self-propelled gun right into their midst and began shooting them up right and left, eventually claiming 11 kills. Later, during the last hours of the German retreat to the Narva bridgehead on 31 January 1944, Sporck stayed back alone with his armored vehicle and patrolled far to the east of the main battle lines, seeking out enemy tanks and vehicles and providing protection for stragglers. At dusk, with the enemy close behind, Sporck's assault gun was the last vehicle to cross into the German lines. For his initiative and valor, Casper Sporck was later awarded the Knight's Cross.

* * *

On 12 June 1944 at the "Sunshine" outpost to the southeast of the Narva bridgehead, the Danish NCO Egon Christophersen literally saved the main front, when with a small assault troop he counterattacked German trenches that had been seized by the Russians and regained them in hand-to-hand combat. Christophersen and his men then defended the positions against all attackers, enabling the broken German lines to reconsolidate and hold. Christophersen was awarded the Knight's Cross.

* * *

At the Vepskula bridgehead on the wast bank of the Narva River in February 1944, the bedraggled German forces were unable to eliminate a dangerous Soviet inroad. Fresh Estonian assault troops were brought in. For a time

they too were pinned down. Then the young Estonian Sergeant Haralt Nugiseks led a leap-frog attack that broke through the communist lines. In vicious close combat the enemy trenches were cleared all the way to the river's edge. Nugiseks was awarded the Knight's Cross.

* * *

In August 1943 on the Wolchov Front, the Latvian Sergeant Zanis Butkus led a storm troop into the enemy lines and proceeded to capture a string of communist bunkers without loss. He returned to the German lines with many prisoners and much booty. Butkus was given an officer's commission on the spot. Later, after taking part in 59 close combat engagements, Butkus was awarded the Knight's Cross.

* * *

In July 1944, on the north side of "Orphanage Hill" on the Narva Front, the Flemish NCO Remi Schyrnen singlehandedly knocked out more than a dozen enemy tanks while wounded and cutoff from his unit. In a 48 hour period he turned back—all by himself—several Soviet tank attacks that would have encircled the Flemish and Estonian volunteer battalions fighting nearby. He even scored a lucky "double kill" when one shot from his anti-tank gun penetrated through two tanks advancing side-by-side. Incredibly, in January 1944, Schyrnen had pulled off a similar feat to save the "Langemarck" Brigade near Zhitomir. Schyrnen was awarded the Knight's Cross.

* * *

Strong Soviet tank forces were attacking along the road south of Dorpat in eastern Estonia in August 1944 with the intention of severing the entire Estonian Front. The only things blocking their way were three anti-tank guns from the "Wallonien" Division under the direct command of the Walloon Lieutenant Leon Gillis. Gillis positioned his guns directly in the road and flung back attack after attack. In furious fighting that raged all day, the anti-tank guns were destroyed and most of the Walloons wounded. The whole front hinged on Gillis' next move. He chose to attack. The

Walloon volunteers knocked out three more tanks with hand grenades and drove back the rest. The enemy was unable to advance. Leon Gillis was awarded the Knight's Cross.

* * *

In February 1945, the communists were closing in on the military training camp at Neuhammer in Silesia. The Hungarian Captain, Georg Hermandy in command of the emergency battalion of the 26th SS Division "Hungaria" led his unit in a valiant counterattack to prevent a breakthrough. Even after being badly wounded, Hermandy insisted upon staying in the front lines and directed a successful defensive battle that saved the Neuhammer sector. After the fighting, the *Wehrmacht* Colonel in charge of the area visited the Hungarian SS positions, took off his own Knight's Cross and draped it around the neck of Hermandy. *Waffen-Haupsturmführer* George Hermandy was subsequently killed on 23 March 1945 leading his men in yet another counterattack.

* * *

The last bridgehead on the east bank of the Oder River in March 1945 was held by the I. Battalion/SS Regiment Division "Wallonien," led by the Walloon Major Henri Derriks. Derriks, or "Der Boss" as he was known to his men, deployed his two tanks and his companies of infantrymen with cool decisiveness, enabling the last German soldiers and refugees to make their way to safety. Finally, with the communists closing in from three sides, Derriks calmly pulled back his forces step-by-step and got them safely across the river, destroying the last bridge behind them. It was nothing new for "Der Boss," he had earlier commanded the last group of "Wallonien" soldiers to fight their way out of the Cherkassy encirclement in south Ukraine. Later, Derriks led the last assault of the "Wallonien" Division on the Eastern Front. Among his many decorations for bravery, *Sturmbannführer* Henri Derricks received the German Cross in Gold.

* * *

And there were many, many more European heroes, most of whom would not have their deeds recorded at all but would instead find a final resting place in an unmarked grave somewhere in the "East." We cannot begin to do justice to them in this paper, but we can hopefully, lift part of the veil that has hidden their exploits for so long a time.

The Reckoning

We are now at the point where it can be asked, what does this discussion of the European Volunteer Movement prove? I think that it has at least validated the following statement by Beadle and Hartmann in their book, *The Waffen-SS: Its Divisional Insignia:* (p4)

> By 1945, the *Waffen-SS* had proved by its combat success that European people could exist together, but as long as they recognized and accepted the national differences between one another. It had been in the *Waffen-SS* that, for the first time, Dutch had been commanded by Germans and Germans by Belgians. It was this idealism, dearly bought on the roads of Russia and later in its slave labor camps, that created an outstanding spirit of comradeship and combatant ability among all members, regardless of nationality or rank.

Beadle and Hartmann also made one other trenchant statement that I hope is born out in this essay: (p4)

> The greatest triumph of the *Waffen-SS* though, was not on the field of battle. It was in its policy of recruiting non-German volunteers, not as hired mercenaries, but as co-fighters for a European ideal.

After a generation of slander, vilification and falsehood concerning the European volunteers, the first rays of light are beginning to shine through. Slowly, but surely, their story is being told. As for the soldiers themselves, many are of the belief that they were ahead of their time, both militarily and philosophically, and that their legacy is yet to be fulfilled.

For myself, perhaps the most incisive observation was made by the former *Waffen-SS* Colonel Jochen Peiper in a letter to his comrades while he was being held in American

confinement under sentence of death: "Don't forget that it was in the ranks of the SS that the *first* European died. . ."

Bibliography

Beadle, C. and Hartmann, T., *The Waffen-SS, Its Divisional Insignia*, Key Publications, 1971.

Bender, R. and Taylor, H.P.,*Uniforms, Organization and History of the Waffen-SS*, Bender Publishing, 4 Volumes, 1969-75.

Buss, P. and Mollo, A., *Hitler's Germanic Legions*, Macdonalds and Janes, 1978.

Cerff, Karl, *Die Waffen-SS im Wehrmachtbericht*, Munin Verlag, 1971.

Degrelle, Leon, *Die verlorene Legion*, Verlag K.W. Schuetz, new printing, 1972.

De la Maziere, Christian, *The Captive Dreamer*, Saturday Review Press, 1974.

Haaest, Erik, *Frontsvin, Frostknuder, Forraedere*, Bogans Forlag, 3 Volumes, 1975.

Hausser, Paul, *Soldaten wie andere auch*, Munin Verlag, 1966.

Hausser, Paul, *Waffen-SS im Einsatz*, Verlag K.W. Schuetz, 9th printing, 1976.

Heike, Wolf-Dietrich, *Sie wollten die Freiheit*, Podzun Verlag, new printing, 1978.

Historia #32: *L'Internationale SS*, Paris, 1973

Huxley-Blythe, Peter, *The East Came West*, Caxton Press, 2nd printing, 1968.

Kern, Erich, *The Dance of Death*, Collins, 1951.

Littlejohn, David, *The Patriotic Traitors*, Doubleday, 1972.

Littlejohn, David, *Foreign Legions of the Third Reich Volume One*, Bender Publishing, 1979.

Landemar, Henri, *Les Waffen-SS*, Balliard, 1972.

Mabire, Jean, *Berlin im Todeskampf 1945*, Verlag K.W. Schuetz, 1977.

Reider, Frederic, *La Waffen-SS*, Pensee Moderne, 1975.

Schneider, Jost W., *Their Honor Was Loyalty*, Bender Publishing, 1978.

Stein, George, *The Waffen-SS: Hitler's Elite Guard at War*, Cornell University Press, 1966.

Steiner, Felix, *Die Armee der Geächteten*, Verlag K.W. Schuetz, 4th printing, 1971.

Steiner, Felix, *Der Freiwilligen*, Verlag K.W. Schuetz, 5th printing 1973.

Strassner, Peter, *Europäische Freiwilligen: Die 5 Panzer Division Wiking*, Munin-Verlag, 1968.

Taylor, H.P., *Germanische SS, 1940-45*, Historical Research Unit/ Uniforms of the SS series, 1969.

Tieke, Wilhelm, *Das Finnische Freiwilligen Bataillon der Waffen-SS*, Munin-Verlag, 1979.

Tieke, Wilhelm, *Im Luftransport an Brennpunkte der Ostfront*, Munin-Verlag, 1971.

Tieke, Wilhelm, *Tragödie um die Treue*, Munin-Verlag, 3rd printing, 1978.

Wenn alle Brueder schweigen, Munin-Verlag, 1973 & 1975 editions.

Periodicals

Berkenkruis, Birch Cross/Belgium: Publication of the Flemish Waffen-SS veterans association. Various issues.

Der Freiwillige, Munin-Verlag: Monthly magazine of the Waffen-SS veteran's self-help association. 1965 to date.

Siegrunen: The Waffen-SS in Historical Perspective, Glendale, Oregon, all issues, 1976 to date.

Siegrunen Bulletin, Glendale, Oregon, all issues 1979 to date.

Siegrunen Anthology 1, Glendale, Oregon, Spring 1979.

Other Material

Documents, letters, maps, photos, and records in the author's archives.

Verordnungsblatt der Waffen-SS 1941-45. Some issues.

Buchenwald and After

LEONHARD FRIEDRICH

In 1942 I was served with a warrant for my arrest by the Gestapo. The warrant alleged that I was "corrupting the unity of the German people during wartime."

I appealed against this warrant of arrest but heard absolutely nothing more about it. On 5 October I arrived in Buchenwald after having spent two nights in a prison in Halle. In Halle there was very great overcrowding and incredibly bad food. There too, as in all prisons in which I had been, there were plenty of vermin.

At Buchenwald

Our reception in Buchenwald was not exactly welcoming. First, our personal data and possessions were taken and the experience with the SS man was not exactly pleasant. Then to the so-called bath house of the camp where we had to completely undress, leave our clothes in a heap, and take a bath. From there we were delivered into the hands of the barbers who shaved the hair completely off the head and all parts of our bodies. After a medical examination, we were passed to another department where vests and pants, trousers, jackets and caps were thrown at us. Stockings and socks did not exist, but we were given wooden clogs which soon made our feet raw with blisters. We stood up in the zebra striped uniform "pyjamas" and could hardly recognize ourselves or our mates. We were then given numbers and colors for identification. There were several different kinds—red for political prisoners, green for habitual criminals, black for those regarded as asocial, pink for homosexuals, violet for Jehovah's Witnesses and, of course, the yellow "Star of David" for the Jews.

We were then taken to a barracks in which all contact with other inmates of the camp was prevented. We were not only

political prisoners but all kinds of thieves and criminals. There were 42 different nationalities in Buchenwald. At the time of my committal, the concentration camp was not very big, about 8 000 to 10 000 prisoners, whereas later the population increased to 47 000. During the first few days we were allocated all kinds of unskilled work and eventually I came to a work team which was doing some ground levelling in Weimar where some factories were being built. Apart from the dreadful pain in my feet as a result of the wooden clogs I had to wear, I also had great trouble with my hands which were not used to working with a pick and shovel. I was then transferred to the penal group—something I still don't understand. These people were accommodated in special barracks separate from the rest of the camp. The treatment in these barracks was for the most part meted out by prisoners which defies any description. It was not only the SS who made most trouble for me, but rather some of the old lags who were in command. When one had the chance to discover something about their past, one could really understand that they were the sort of people from whom society should be protected. Later still I came to work in the stone quarry company which was building one of the crematoria of the concentration camp.

Every now and then I found people who were well intentioned towards me, but the condition of my health deteriorated steadily. I had no particular complaint, it was mainly weakness probably due to lack of food. I had no news from home, and was not allowed to write. It was, therefore, a great joy when, at the end of November, an inquiry came from Mary addressed to the commander of the camp. To begin with they were angry and shouted at me asking why I had not written home and when I explained I had not been allowed to, I was ordered to send off a letter that very night. To my great joy a new directive had been issued to the effect that prisoners were allowed to receive parcels of food and essential clothing from their homes. I wrote this to Mary and said that I could do with some boots and other things, and from that time onwards my health improved. While I was in Buchenwald Mary sent me a parcel every week, to the contents of which many kind friends contributed. I can say today

with a clear conscience that it is to them that I owe thanks that I am still alive. I could hardly have survived the suffering and brutal treatment had it not been for this material support and the thoughts and prayers of so many who remembered me.

Winter

In the meantime, I was transferred to a different work team—the so-called sewerage and drainage squad. In this team we had to carry out all the drainage operations—that is to say, digging and closing ditches carrying heavy drain pipes and everything that went with it. I generally worked with bandaged hands because I was not very fit to do this work, but somehow I managed it despite great exhaustion. While working out of doors we were particularly exposed to all sorts of harassment by the SS men. They came and went and took the least opportunity to report us and subject us to beatings. During the first winter we had very thin coats which did not afford much protection. As soon as the sky was a little brighter we were ordered to take the coats off and we had to work in the freezing cold. Our day began in the morning at 4:30 and then we were given half a litre of coffee or the so-called morning soup which consisted of boiled bran. An hour later we had to stand for a roll call then the various columns marched to work.

About the tortures and ill treatment meted out to people I will say very little because this is now well known. I can only say that I personally experienced quite a bit of it but in the end by divine providence I was spared the worst.

In Buchenwald the prisoners had to carry out any work, clearing forests, constructing complete huts and factories. Any work between these operations, such as road construction, drainage, electrical engineering, was carried out by prisoners who eventually worked in the completed factories.

In June 1943 I was put in a works store and eventually became in charge of it. Now I had a chance of achieving a certain personal independence—that is during the working hours of the day. There was a lot of unpleasantness now and then, but I did however manage to cope with it. In the con-

centration camp itself conditions deteriorated increasingly as so many prisoners came to Buchenwald, especially in the last winter, when the big camps in the East had to be cleared. In November, December and January they arrived in open coal trucks in which they had travelled from six to fourteen weeks. I cannot talk about the misery I have seen. Food was scanty, warm clothes were non-existent and travelling for weeks in an open railway truck without any sanitary arrangements—it is not surprising that many died. The camps were overcrowded so that in spite of all safety measures taken, the prisoners suffered from all sorts of illnesses and the death rate rose alarmingly. Added to this were the many atrocities to which we were subjected at the so-called roll calls. We had often to stand for hours till the result was correct or if anyone was missing till it had been established who it was or until he had been found. These roll calls cost many lives as no consideration was taken whether it was snowing or raining. There is much I could say about this, especially about what happened towards the end. Most of those who came from the camps in the East were again removed in March 1945, this time on foot since the railways were no longer running. Those who couldn't walk any more, or stepped aside, were shot en route. The corpses were left lying in the ditches. In this manner the population of the camp decreased to about 21 000 by the time the allied troops arrived.

Liberation

The camp of Buchenwald was to be gassed and blown up. The orders for this were given by SS Brigade Tirlewanger, but by good fortune the Americans arrived more quickly than was expected. It was with peculiar feelings that I watched the arrival of the "enemy" who had come to liberate us. We started breathing again, and once more realized that we were human beings. The food which in that year had been particularly wretched, became very good since all the stores left behind by the SS had been given to the camp. After a further five weeks during which I assisted American officers in the

Commission for releasing the prisoners. I arrived home in Pyrmont on Whit Sunday.

I must praise the Jehovah's Witnesses who, in spite of ridicule and persecution, held in the most wonderful way firmly to their beliefs. I am today of the opinion that we in Germany could only have come to such a state because the religious strength and the inner life of individuals were allowed to deteriorate. We will always find that the men and women who frankly confess their belief in their God without hesitation will be given the inner strength, even in these times, to hope for a better future.

As I left the camp it became perfectly clear to me that I had two great duties,, namely not to forget the 51 000 dead left in Buchenwald, and secondly to help show to the world that the German people are not what the Nazis and criminals made them appear to be.

'Holocaust' Pharmacology
vs.
Scientific Pharmacology

HORST KEHL

THE DEATH CAMP TREBLINKA: A DOCUMENTARY, edited by Alexander Donat, Holocaust Library, New York, 320pp, hardback, $9.95, ISBN: 0-89604-009-7

This book is presented as a documentary, and indeed is catalogued as such in the Library of Congress Index. The editor has authored only ten pages of the text, the rest is a collection of testimonies from survivors, collated and chronicled by one Rachel Auerbach, who was never in the camp herself.

Careful analysis of the testimony of the six eye-witnesses reveals numerous contradictions and impossiblities. Perhaps an overactive imagination on the part of the ghost-writer is responsible. Or perhaps it is the eye-witnesses themselves who are prone to slight exaggerations; Gerald Reitlinger, the noted Exterminationist, cautions against taking too literally the testimony of eastern European Jews (*The Final Solution*, Sphere, London, p581). One of the more obvious exaggerations is the allegation by one eye-witness, Samuel Willenberg, that he saw a nude girl leap over a 3 meter (9 feet) high barbed wire fence in order to escape the gas chambers. Let us now look at some of the less obvious canards.

One of the key issues concerning Treblinka is of course the duration of its existence, and number of people who passed through its facilities. According to the Commandant of the camp, Dr. Irmfried Eberl, the camp was opened on 7 July 1942, and closed on 2 August 1943 after a revolt broke

out and the camp was burned to the ground.

However, according to the chronicler Rachel Auerbach, there were mass executions going on at Treblinka from 23 July 1942 through the middle of September 1943. This would seem to indicate that there were gassings going on at Treblinka six weeks after the camp and gas chambers had been burned to the ground!

Since the camp was only in operation for 400 days (give or take six weeks) there would have had to be a very busy daily throughput of exterminatees to attain the very high estimates of total victims. These total estimates range from as low as 700 000 to as high as 1 200 000 (pp9, 14, 25, 52). There are even contradictions within one witness's own testimony. On page 52 we are told that 20 000 corpses were processed daily by the gas chambers, but on the following page he says that only 6 000 were killed each day. Another witness does the same thing: on page 159 we are told that 10 000—12 000 were gassed each day, and then on page 164 it becomes 30 000.

Clearly there are some rather major incongruities with respect to the daily death toll, and the capacities of the extermination facilities. The reader can take almost any figure he pleases. But still one has to bear in mind that the camp was only in existence for just over a year.

The *modus operandi* of the gassing itself is likewise somewhat contradictory. On page 12 it is reported that a motor was used to gas victims with its exhaust fumes, and this is further amplified on page 49 when the motor becomes the engine of a captured Russian tank. Page 157 advises us that this method took nearly one hour to kill the victims. Various other methods are bandied around including "hot steam" (p130), "chlorine asphyxiation" (p24), but alack and alas, our old friend Zyklon B does not get a look in. It seems that the fiendish human devils of the Holocaust kingdom had not gotten their act sufficiently together to order the same method of extermination at each of the myriad mills of death.

The size and capacity of the gas chambers is described in some detail. Eye-witness Jankiel Wiernik states on page 158 that the gas chambers were 5 x 5 meters, which is 25 square

meters (250 square feet). Into this chamber 450—500 persons were crowed. Simple arithmetic tells the reader that each person therefore had only one half square foot each, or 6 inches by 6 inches. Is this practically possible? Try it and see.

Later, 10 additional chambers were added (p161) to the original 3 (p157). These new gas chambers were 7 x 7 meters each, or 49 square meters (500 square feet). While these new super gas chambers were much roomier than before, 1000 - 1200 people were crowded into these. The height of these new chambers is given as 1.9 meters, which is less than 6 feet. Presumably the victims were either all short people, or they were asked to stoop!

The total capacity of the entire 13 gas chambers can now be calculated. 10 chambers times an average of 1100 equals 11 000; the 3 smaller chambers held 500 each, which is 1500; making a grand total per complete gassing operation of 12 500 victims. One should compare this with the reported figures on pages 52, 53, 159 and 164.

What happened to the bodies? Again, we enter a quagmire of impossibilities. At first, all the corpses (12 500 a day?) were buried in large ditches in the camp (pp86, 90, 92 and 105). But as the entire camp was only 15 hectares (p70) which is about 37 acres, one would soon use up all the available ditches. A map on pages 318—319 shows that much of the land was taken up with the camp buildings and workshops, leaving only about 3 hectares (7 acres) for such mass burials.

The authors try to get around this problem by telling us that after April 1943 the bodies were burned, and not buried. One eye-witness speculates that this was because the Germans had just discovered the mass-graves of Poles murdered by Soviets at Katyn, and they didn't want the same thing to happen to them (p169). But here too we are presented with a number of contradictory statements.

On page 171 we are told about pyres in winter, but we are obliged to ask, which winter, since the burning began in April 1943 and ended in September the same year. Likewise, a bizarre story on pages 190—199 relates how new arrivals saw the funeral pyres and revolted. They were all

shot and next morning their bodies were covered with snow. Although the weather in eastern Europe does leave a lot to be desired, we were not aware that snow was a common feature in April - September.

The cremations allow the eye-witnesses' imaginations to really run riot. On page 38 we are told that human blood makes first class combustion material. This will come as a surprise to us physicians who have been believing all along that blood is 70% water! On the same page we are told that young bodies burn better than old ones, which also seem strange when we consider that younger bodies contain more water than their elders. Continuing on the same page, we are startled to learn that "Men don't burn without women." The "explanation" for this is that the fat of women is used as kindling and to maintain the fires. On page 32 we are informed that pans would be placed beneath the grilles to catch the fat as it ran off, for use in—wouldn't we know—soap making. Leaving aside the fact that we were told on page 13 that the victims were all skin and bone, we wonder what wondrous pathological discovery was made by the angels of death at Treblinka, which enable them to determine these qualities of female tissue which were previously —and since—totally unknown to modern science.

The burnings were carried out in two ways, it seems. bodies were stacked up on grates or grilles of old railroad tracks (p170) 100 - 150 meters along (300 - 450 feet). These grates could hold 3000 bodies at a time, and 10 000 - 12 000 bodies were burned each day. Other burnings took place in ditches, though how oxygen was supplied to the combustion in such a ditch is not explained (pp92, 105, 156). Page 170 informs us that the bodies were doused with gasoline, but surely this would only result in charring, not burning, due to the flash characteristics of gasoline combustion. (Could it be that all that female fat acted as some sort of catalyst perhaps?)

Although Treblinka is classified as a death camp, some rather lively things seem to have gone on there. If the sole function of the camp was to process living humans into ashes / fat / soap / etc. it seems rather odd that a zoo was

maintained (pp47, 318), Jewish services were conducted (p63), children lived there (p64), black market activites went on (p124), gold dollars and fine liquor were traded (p50), there were cigarette rations (p176), there was a radio listening post and underground camp newspaper. One eye-witness reports that some victims arrived in express trains, complete with dining cars (p64)!

Later on, we are given an example of the bruality of the guards, when an incident is described where a guard tore a child in half and the child's naked feet still stood standing: frozen to the ground (p163).

It is this kind of lurid imagination which gives the lie to the entire thesis. If it is impossible to tear a child in half; if it is impossible to burn bodies in ditches; if it is impossible to cram people into half a square foot each; if it is impossible to use women as kindling and scoop up buckets of human fat; if it is impossible to leap over a 9 feet high fence; just what other parts of this saga are true?

The authors display their extremism and inattention to consistency when they place Treblinka as a "death camp" just as "Dachau, Buchenwald, Belsen" and others (p54). If the editors at "Holocaust Library" had done their homework properly they would know that the official Exterminationist line is that there were no gassings in the German camps at all; "only in the Polish camps." Martin Broszat (head of the Holocaust Institute in Munich) says so in *Die Zeit* of 26 August 1960. Simon Wiesenthal says so in *Books & Bookmen* of April 1975. Gitta Sereny says so in the *New Statesman* of 2 November 1979. Maybe the "Holocaust Librarians" know something that they don't!

ABOUT THE CONTRIBUTORS

JOHN BENNETT is a 42 year old Australian lawyer who works in the Public Defender's Office of the federal Australian Government in Melbourne. He graduated in Law with honors from the University of Melbourne in 1958, and in Arts with honors in 1966. Since 1966 he has been Secretary of the Victorian Council for Civil Liberties.

LEONHARD FRIEDRICH was born in Germany in 1899 and died in Bridport, Dorset, England in March 1978. He was a prominent German Quaker (Society of Friends), and with his English wife Mary, had run a Quaker Center in Nürnberg before World War Two. In 1942 he was arrested by the Gestapo for giving aid and shelter to Jewish and pacifist war-resisters. He spent the rest of the war in Buchenwald concentration camp. His fairly objective account of life at Buchenwald was the subject of a talk he gave in 1947 at Bad Pyrmont Quaker Center. The talk was later transcribed in *Der Quaker*, and later still, was translated and published in the *Quaker Monthly* (1979, p201; $7pa; Friends House, Euston Road, London NW1 2BJ, England). We publish this feature here verbatim—including the author's speculation about "gassing"—on account of its remarkable value as first-hand testimony to the true nature of the camps.

HORST KEHL was born in 1933 in Germany and attended public school in Frankfurt and Lauterbach. He later attended the Seminary Marienhohe Darmstadt, did undergraduate work at the College of Idaho and Montana State University, and took a graduate degree from the University of Idaho. He is currently a Professor of Pharmacology at KCOM, Missouri.

RICHARD LANDWEHR is the editor of *Siegrunen*, a militaria magazine specializing in the Waffen-SS. Subscriptions are $6 per year, from Box 70, Mount Reuben Road, Glendale, OR 97442. This paper was presented for him at the 1980 Revisionist Convention by Ray Merriam, editor of *Military Journal*.

JAMES J. MARTIN graduated in History from the University of New Hampshire in 1942, and received his MA (1945) and Ph.D. (1949) degrees in History from the University of Michigan. He has taught History at educational institutions from coast to coast. His first book *Men Against the State* is widely regarded as the best history of early American libertarianism and anarchism. Dr. Martin has since written and edited a large number of history texts.

MARK WEBER was born and raised in Oregon, and was educated at various universities around the world: Portland (OR) State University, University of Illinois, University of Munich, and Indiana State University. In 1976 obtained his BA with high honors in History, and in 1977 he was awarded an MA in central European History. He now works in Washington DC as a freelance researcher and German translator.